

EMIEL EYBEN

RESTLESS YOUTH

IN ANCIENT ROME



Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

**RESTLESS YOUTH IN ANCIENT
ROME**

RESTLESS YOUTH IN ANCIENT ROME

Emiel Eyben

*Translated from the original Dutch by Dr
Patrick Daly*



London and New York

Earlier versions of this book have appeared as *De jonge Romein volgens de literaire bronnen der periode ca. 200 v. Chr. tot ca. 500 n. Chr.* (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1977) and *De onstuimigen. Jeugd en (on)deugd in het Oude Rome* (Kapellen: de Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1987).

This edition first published 1993
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or
Routledge’s collection of thousands of eBooks please go to
www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

© 1977, 1987, 1993 Emiel Eyben

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or
utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in
any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing
from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Eyben, Emiel
Restless Youth in Ancient Rome.—2Rev.ed
I. Title
936.008

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Eyben, Emiel
[Onstuimigen. English]
Restless youth in ancient Rome/Emiel Eyben.
p. cm.
Translation of: De onstuimigen.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Youth—Rome. I. Title.
DG91.E9213 1993
305.23’0937—dc20
92-7227

ISBN 0-203-16848-8 Master e-book ISBN
ISBN 0-203-26367-7 (Adobe eReader Format)

ISBN 0-415-04366-2 (Print Edition)

TO MY 'RESTLESS' FATHER

CONTENTS

	INTRODUCTION	1
I	YOUTH AS A DISTINCT AGE OF MAN	5
	<i>A society that gave its youth its head</i>	6
	<i>Every age of man has its unique character</i>	9
	<i>Youth as an age of crisis</i>	11
	<i>Educators—the severe and the soft-hearted</i>	16
	<i>Why was youth reputedly so lacking in virtue?</i>	19
	<i>A psychological portrait</i>	30
II	YOUTH AND THE ESTABLISHED ORDER	41
	<i>Youth and the army</i>	41
	<i>Youth and politics</i>	51
	<i>The young man at the bar</i>	70
III	THE LEISURE ACTIVITIES OF YOUTH	79
	<i>Sports and athletics</i>	79
	<i>Music and dance</i>	85
	<i>The spectacles</i>	86
	<i>Dandies, revellers and spendthrifts</i>	95
	<i>Vandalism</i>	104
	<i>Peer-groups</i>	109
IV	YOUTHFUL THINKING	124
	<i>The way of learning</i>	124
	<i>Eloquence</i>	135

	<i>Philosophy</i>	154
	<i>Poetry</i>	171
V	THE EMOTIONAL LIFE OF THE YOUNG ROMAN	196
	<i>Older people and parents</i>	196
	<i>Friends and idols</i>	207
	<i>Sex and love</i>	223
	CONCLUSION	247
	<i>Notes</i>	251
	<i>Bibliography</i>	308
	<i>Index locorum</i>	344
	<i>Subject index</i>	363

INTRODUCTION

Under some conditions even contentiousness and rashness have a certain timeliness and grace becoming to youths.

(Plutarch, *An seni*, 19,794A)

Age is another cause of difference. For the same air seems chilly to the old but mild to those in their prime; and the same colour appears faint to older men but vivid to those in their prime; and similarly the same sound seems to the former faint, but to the latter clearly audible. Moreover, those who differ in age are differently moved in respect of choice and avoidance. For whereas children—to take a case—are all eagerness for balls and hoops, men in their prime choose other things, and old men yet others. And from this we conclude that differences in age also cause different impressions to be produced by the same underlying objects.

(Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrh. hyp.*, 1,105–6)

‘Timeless’ historiography does not exist. Each new generation attempts to reinterpret the history of the past in the light of questions arising from its experience of the contemporary world.¹ The present study—like women’s history² or the history of sexuality³—is no exception to this phenomenon, having originally taken shape in the late 1960s, when, perhaps more than ever in world history, youth developed its own lifestyle and made its mark on world events and contemporary society.

This is a study of youth in ancient Rome, a study of the phase of life falling between childhood and adulthood. It cannot be said that

in the past much attention has been paid to the subject, nor that its subject matter has been particularly easy to tackle. This monograph deals with Roman antiquity from roughly 200 BC to AD 500, and attempts to provide a survey of the perceptions the ancients had of youth, and of the role of this age group in a wide variety of domains—philosophy, literature, education, the law, the army, politics; to say nothing of leisure activities, amorous pursuits, family life.

This is not the first time that I have attempted to re-create the world of Roman youth. My doctoral dissertation goes back to 1969 and a first, comprehensive study of the subject in Dutch was published under the auspices of the Belgian Royal Academy in 1977 under the title *De jonge Romein volgens de literaire bronnen der periode ca. 200 v. Chr. tot ca. 500 n. Chr.* (LVI, 691pp.) [The young Roman: a study from the literary sources from the period ca. 200 v. Chr. tot 500 n. Chr.] abbreviated in this book as *jR*. Ten years later—in 1987—a condensed and adapted version of the original study was published by ‘De Nederlandsche Boekhandel/ Kok Agora’, entitled *De onstuimigen. Jeugd en (on)deugd in de Romeinse Oudheid* (214 p.) [The Hot-heads. Youth and (mis)behaviour in Roman antiquity.] The present study in English is a half-way house between its two predecessors. The critical apparatus of the original has been greatly reduced, yet readers who desire more information (including parallel texts, further examples and a more extensive bibliography) can easily consult the bibliography, notes and indexes in the first edition.

However, I have not been resting since 1977; nor has research activity in the domain of ancient history—and youth⁴—come to a halt. An attempt has been made to incorporate the findings of recent research to make this edition not simply a condensed version of my full-length study, but a revised and improved one as well. The overall picture of Roman youth has been developed and amended here and there, although none of the additional evidence has led me to any significant change in the views which I put forward in the original edition.

The aim of the present work is to present a synoptic representation of the youth of Roman antiquity, to highlight the characteristics which prevailed throughout the period, and to discern the various ways in which the world of the young was transformed and changed, in which youth itself put its stamp on its environment. It is obvious that the behaviour pattern of young Romans changed quite considerably over the centuries. The

perceptions of youth described in [Chapter 1](#) did not greatly change, yet the way in which the young lived the years of their youth, their behaviour in private and public life (Chapters 2–3), their way of thinking ([Chapter 4](#)) and their feelings ([Chapter 5](#)) underwent quite a considerable development. So I have made use of a fourfold division which returns in almost every chapter: the early Republic until c. 200 BC; the later Republic until c. 30 BC; the early Empire until c. AD 200; and the late Empire. The fact that the compass of this study embraces youth throughout the Roman world and history means that from the first century BC Greek youth is also included. The whole Mediterranean world was more homogeneous in those days than now. The similarities between the world of the young in East and in West were greater than the differences.

Not all social classes are equally well represented in this study. It is concerned largely with young people from a wealthy, ‘metropolitan’ background. Young people from less prosperous families or from the countryside are passed over in almost complete silence, for the simple reason that the surviving source-material reveals little or nothing about them. Well-to-do people wrote history and neglected the poor. And girls, regrettably but necessarily, crop up only *en passant*. Almost all sources were written by men, and girls, by contrast to their male peers, married very young, i.e. between 12 and 15; they were still children when they became spouses. They hardly even knew their youth. It should be mentioned also that, because I am preparing a separate study on youth and Christianity, Christian youths will appear only sporadically in this book, in so far as they illustrate tendencies existing in the secular world.

In order to bring the world of the young Roman male of the propertied classes to life, I relied largely on literary sources, although epigraphical and papyrological material also proved itself occasionally useful. The ancient authors—usually older people writing about (their own) youth, although some (especially poets) were young—are often cited in their own words, because it seems to me the most convenient and effective method of rendering the way the ancients thought, felt and lived, and of avoiding (inevitable?) accusations of anachronism.

It affords me great pleasure to thank so many individuals and institutions who have been of invaluable assistance to me in the preparation and publication of this book: the publisher Routledge, its desk editor, Virginia Myers, and its senior editor, Richard

Stoneman, whose confidence in this project I hope will not have been misplaced; the National Foundation for Scientific Research (NFWO) of Belgium and the Catholic University of Leuven (K.U.Leuven) who made the research on which the book is based possible; De Nederlandsche Boekhandel and the Belgian Royal Academy, who gave their approval for an English edition; the editors of the Loeb Classical Library for permission to use extracts from their translations of the classical authors. My gratitude is also due to Professor T.Reekmans, the book's 'spiritual father'; Dr P.H.Daly, my translator; the classical scholars Suzanne Dixon, Werner Krenkel and Thomas Wiedemann, who, despite heavy commitments and the demands of their own research, found time to read my manuscript and offer much useful advice on language and contents. There are *many* others whom I would like to mention by name, yet I believe those concerned will be aware of my gratitude. Nevertheless, the author alone is responsible for the work's shortcomings and his alone is the blame whenever it could be better than it is.

I YOUTH AS A DISTINCT AGE OF MAN¹

Scholars such as J.H. Van den Berg and Ph. Ariès²—not professional historians by origin—introduced a dramatic innovation in historical approaches. Influenced by their pioneering— and stimulating—research on, for example, children in the past, not everybody in modern psychology, sociology or history considers childhood—or youth, old age, maternal love...—as a natural, universal, ageless and self-evident ‘phenomenon’. For F. Musgrove, for example, the concept of youth as a separate age of man is rather recent. This scholar—a sociologist—expresses his opinion in a radical way:

The adolescent as a distinct species is the creation of modern social attitudes and institutions. A creature neither child nor adult, he is a comparatively recent socio-psychological *invention*, scarcely two centuries old.... The adolescent was *invented* [my italics] at the same time as the steam-engine. The principal architect of the latter was Watt in 1765, of the former Rousseau in 1762.³

We cannot discuss this question in detail here, but such utterances, although they sound good, are, in my eyes at least, a simplification of historical reality. Much more nuanced is the view of, for example, A. Kriekemans, who is of the opinion that, depending on the cultural environment, the term ‘youth’ may cover different periods of life, is more or less complicated, involves varying levels of conflict, and has its own identity, its own way of living, its own status, its own expectations.⁴ Let us apply these words to Roman antiquity and examine the place of youth in the human life-span, the social and other circumstances which made possible its existence

as a separate entity, people's attitude towards it, and its characteristics.

A SOCIETY THAT GAVE ITS YOUTH ITS HEAD⁵

The Romans divided the human life-span into several phases.⁶ The categories advanced by Varro (117–27 BC) are the best known. This scholar distinguished five fifteen-year periods in human life. For him *adulescentia* fell between *pueritia* (from birth until 15) and *iuventus* (from 30 until 45).⁷

Adulthood is termed *iuventus* in Varro's classification; this refers to the famous reform of the army by Servius Tullius, in which citizens were divided into three age groups. Men were considered *pueri* up to the age of 17, *iuniores* up to the age of 46; anyone older belonged to the *seniores*. *Iuventus*, youth (or more accurately (young) adulthood) thus lasted from 17 to 46 in these early times, and the males falling within this age-group had as their task the defence of the fatherland.⁸ In a later period, too, *iuventus* could have a wide application, yet, unlike in the scheme proposed by Varro, it was not normally considered the age which followed *adulescentia*. A young man between the ages of 15 and 30 could be termed *adulescens* as well as *iuvenis*.⁹

The distinction drawn by Varro between *iuventus* and *adulescentia* is quite artificial. On the other hand, his categorization reflects social realities. Youth starts when the boy assumes the adult toga (*toga virilis*); it ends with the beginning of a political career, the *cursus honorum*.

The acceptance of the adult toga¹⁰—a 'rite of passage' which marked the transition from childhood to manhood—was a big event in a young man's life. He cast off certain attributes of childhood (the *insignia pueritiae*) such as the *bulla* (a locket which contained a charm against the evil eye) and the *toga praetexta*¹¹ (a toga with a purple border which was worn by children and some high magistrates and priests), and put on the *toga virilis*, a snow-white garment which was also called *toga pura* and *toga libera*, terms which owed their origin not so much to the fact that this ceremony marked the inauguration of freedom—which was in fact the case¹²—but to the fact that initiation into adulthood usually, though by no means always, took place on 17 March, the day on which the feast of the Italian god of fertility, Liber, was traditionally celebrated.

The age at which the adult toga was assumed was not always the same. It was parents who decided whether their son had the necessary physical and mental maturity. In an earlier period the formal change of dress generally took place at the age of 17, an age at which physical puberty had been attained some time previously and at which military service began. In a fairly primitive society, such a person was deemed sufficiently 'matured' to function as a fully fledged member of society. The more complex the social structures became, the less this was the case. The social importance of the acceptance of the adult toga gradually decreased and, hand in hand with this development, the ceremony took place at an earlier age. During the late Republic and early Empire the age ranged from 14 to 16, 14 being the legal minimum age of puberty. In Varro's classification youth began at 15, and this was the age at which the toga was usually adopted in his day.

The *iuventus*, comprising young men between 17 and 46, was not originally subdivided. A change occurred after c. 200 BC. Rome was able to breathe again after the shock of the second Punic War (218–201). It had become the undisputed world power and was flooded with various influences from the Greek world, with luxury and with wealth.¹³ Rome owed its survival to a large extent to the *iuventus*, yet once the war was over the elders, in a world which had now become so much more complex, felt that the younger generation presented a threat and that 17 was much too young an age to let someone bear 'adult responsibility'. The *Lex Villia annalis* (180 BC) and the *Lex [P]laetoria* (c. 200 BC) were largely responsible for the creation of a new sub-category or age-group, the 'real' youth.

At a fairly early stage Romans came to believe that the average young man, given his 'rashness', 'inexperience', 'frivolity' (terms we regularly come across in later legal texts too), was not fit to take the legal consequences of his acts and needed special legal protection in private law. The *Lex Plaetoria*¹⁴ was enacted: it was a measure which offered persons under the age of 25 (*minores XXV annis*) protection against exploitation (*circumscriptio*). Initially the *minor* could only claim protection if he had been deceived intentionally, but later on he was allowed to cancel each transaction, even in the absence of evil intentions. In theory a minor's full legal capacity was not restricted, but in practice a young man quite understandably had difficulty in finding someone who was willing to do business with him; this emerges from Plautus, where a desperate young man cries

out: ‘But, oh dear me, I’m done for by that law regarding minors! Everyone’s afraid of giving credit!’¹⁵

Throughout antiquity the capacity to act, which in theory a young man possessed from the moment he put on the *toga virilis*, had in practice more and more strings attached to it. Alongside the guardianship of children (*tutela impuberum*) there grew up the *cura minorum*, which gnawed more and more at the *de facto* capacities of a youth under 25, and towards the end of antiquity was extended so far that the limits between *cura* and *tutela* became largely blurred and in practice distinction was hardly made any longer between *impuberes* and *minores*.

Minority lasted until the age of 25, a rather advanced age. In later antiquity, however, the emperor could provide young people with the benefit of legal age (the *venia aetatis*), young men at the age of 20, girls at the age of 18, but this was not at all a general measure and required a thorough investigation of their moral conduct, their mental intelligence, and the integrity of their character. ‘On the aforesaid age’, the Theodosian Code continues, ‘since it is midway between fully completed youth and most robust young manhood (*inter plenam perfectamque adulescentiam et robustissimam iuventutem media*), we impose the designation of the age of stability (*firmata aetas*). Therefore the first age is childhood, the following, youth, this age of stability is the third, the fourth is legal age, and the fifth, old age (*ut prima aetas pueritiae sit, sequens adulescentiae, firmata haec tertia, quarta legitima, quinta senectus habeatur*).’¹⁶

In private law the older generation sought to protect the young man against himself; in the political arena the elders tried to protect themselves against the bumptiousness of the younger generation. The earliest step in this direction was the *Lex Villia annalis*,¹⁷ which established (directly or indirectly) a minimum age—probably 27, in any case between 25 and 30—for public office. Under Sulla, the minimum age for the quaestorship was 30, the age at which, according to his contemporary Varro, *adulescentia* came to an end. Augustus reduced the age to 25 so that majority in private law and in politics should coincide. A lower minimum age was unthinkable, for, as Maecenas stated in Dio Cassius’ ‘Roman History’, ‘is it not disgraceful, and indeed hazardous (*αἰσχρὸν καὶ σφαλερὸν*) to entrust the public business to men younger than this, when we never commit our private affairs to any one before he has reached this age?’¹⁸

Originally a young man was in full possession of all his rights at the age of 17, yet from c. 200 BC onwards he had ‘to wait’ until he was 25/30 before he was considered a real adult. If one also takes into account the fact that a young man generally married late and that studies—certainly under the Empire—could take a long time,¹⁹ then it is clear that there was a rather long period during which young people could really be considered young. The Elder Seneca describes this phenomenon well when he puts the following words in a youth’s mouth: ‘I’m having the fun allowable at my age (*concessis aetati iocis utor*); I am taking advantage of the law for young men (*iuvenalis lex*).... As soon as I have got through this normal and indeed almost obligatory apprenticeship (*hoc tirocinium adulescentiae quasi debitum ac sollemne*), I shall return to good ways.’²⁰ Modern scholarship speaks of ‘Jugendraum’ (E.Spranger) or ‘psycho-social moratory’ (E.Erikson); the Romans called it *tirocinium adulescentiae*.

EVERY AGE OF MAN HAS ITS UNIQUE CHARACTER²¹

For Romans like Seneca, each age was endowed with its own specific constitution (*constitutio*), ‘different in the case of the child, the youth, [the man] and the old man’.²² Every age has its own physiology,²³ its typical inclinations; each entails new possibilities and takes away others. The specific characteristics of the different ages are emphasized by Cicero in the following passage, in which each age is ascribed one specific and fundamental hallmark: ‘Life’s race-course is fixed: Nature has only a single path and that path is run but once, and to each stage of existence has been allotted its own appropriate quality (*tempestivitas*); so that the weakness (*infirmitas*) of childhood, the impetuosity (*ferocitas*) of youth, the seriousness (*gravitas*) of middle life, the maturity (*maturitas*) of old age—each bears some of Nature’s fruit, which must be garnered in its own season.’²⁴

Age affects behaviour in a way similar to such factors as, for example, origin, rank, class, sex, social categories, with which it is often mentioned in one and the same breath.²⁵ ‘Men’s seasons, like the year’s, should have their different uses,’ quipped Plautus.²⁶ Nonetheless, not everyone lived up to what was commonly expected of his age.

For example, it sometimes happened that an older person behaved like an insolent and unstable youngster, could not be relied upon and made a fool of himself. Such behaviour met with the strongest disapproval. What people were willing to tolerate in youngsters was deemed as ill befitting someone older: 'An extravagant youth is misbehaving; an extravagant old man is mad... One totters at the usual time, the other at an unusual time, one in his own time, the other in another's; one follows the lead of his years, the other kicks against his old age (*alter annos sequitur, alter senectuti sequitur*).'²⁷

There is the possibility of 'retarded development': that someone regresses to (or remains fixed in) the relative immaturity of an earlier age. On the other hand, it can also happen that a child or lad is mature beyond his years and manifests behaviour one would expect of an adult or an old man, that he gives the impression of seriousness, wisdom and authority which is in sharp contrast to his actual age. The *concordia aetatum*, the harmony between the ages, was posited by Cicero as the ideal.²⁸ Far more, however, than the 'youthful old man', the *puer* or *adulescens senilis* was held in high esteem.²⁹ Particularly in late antiquity this commonplace became extremely popular with pagans and Christians alike. Children or young men were esteemed precisely to the degree to which they did *not* behave like youngsters, but like mature people or old men—an attitude which is typical of a society in which the elders possessed authority and dignity, in which youth was not seen as an 'ideal' but as an 'incomplete', 'defective' phase of life one has to grow out of as quickly as possible.

Yet it certainly was not always the case that such a *Wunderkind* was admired. It was Quintilian's conviction, for example, that a child should be a real child: 'So let not the ripeness of vintage come too soon nor the must turn harsh while yet in the vat; thus it will last for years and mellow with age.'³⁰ Moreover, people often worried about a youngster who was grown up too soon, because it was generally believed that in such a case a boy was not promised a long life: 'Those whom the gods love die young', said the age-old proverb.³¹ In a letter of consolation written by Seneca to Marcia, we read: 'Tell me, Marcia, when you saw in your son, youth that he was, the wisdom of an old man (*senilem in iuvene prudentiam*), a mind victorious over all sensual pleasures, did you think that you could long have the good fortune to keep him safe and unharmed?... Ripe maturity is the sign of an impending destruction; when growth

stops, the end approaches (*indicium imminentis exitii nimia maturitas est; appetit finis, ubi incrementa consumpta sunt*).³²

YOUTH AS AN AGE OF CRISIS³³

People who speak of the ‘crisis of youth’ usually refer, to a troublesome period from a moral and psychological point of view. The young man, however, also goes through a mental ‘crisis’.

Intellectual³⁴

With the onset of puberty the intellectual capacities of the average young man take on a new dimension. Psychologists such as J. Piaget point out that the perceptible, concrete thinking of a child grows into a capacity for imperceptible, theoretical thinking. The adolescent becomes able to abstract, to theorize, to reflect methodically and systematically, and becomes sensitive to the purpose and value of things.

The ancients also believed that a capacity for logical thought emerged with puberty, i.e. at the age of 14.³⁵ Ps.-Plutarch, for example, felt that a human being reached his completion (*τελειότης*) at that age. Just like trees, a man only becomes a complete human being once he begins to produce seed. At the same time as someone reaches puberty, he also develops the awareness of good and evil (*ἐννοια καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ*) and can be trained to recognize the difference.³⁶

There is a yawning gap between childhood and puberty simply because a teenager is able to reason while the child is not. As Seneca writes: ‘A person, once a child, becomes a youth; his peculiar quality is transformed (*alia eius proprietas fit*); for the child could not reason, but the youth possesses reason (*ille enim inrationalis est, hic rationalis*). Certain things not only grow in size as they develop, but grow into something else (*in aliud*).’³⁷ Christian authors took over this opinion. Jerome, for example, speaks of the *interior homo*, the spiritual man, who is ‘born’ at the age of 14 and is so much better than the *exterior homo*, the carnal side of his nature which emerges with him from his mother’s womb and predisposes him to evil.³⁸ With the onset of puberty a young person, in the opinion of Augustine among others, reaches the ‘age of reason’ (*rationales anni*) and gains the insight into what justice and injustice are; although Augustine could not agree, many believed

that one could only speak of sin ‘after the fourteenth year, with the onset of puberty (*ab anni quarti decimi articulo, cum pubescere coeperint*)’.³⁹

The two aspects of puberty—physical maturity (*pubertas carnalis*) on the one hand, spiritual maturity (*pubertas animalis*) on the other—are linked by Tertullian in a remarkable text. Both awake at the age of 14; the latter manifests itself in an enrichment of the intellect, the former in the development of the body. Just as Adam and Eve felt the need to cover their genitals from the moment they knew the difference between good and evil, so the human being gets the same insight at the moment his sexual needs make themselves felt. On reaching this stage, a person leaves behind a paradise, the paradise of innocence, and becomes tormented by new desires which are sinful.⁴⁰

A youth can put his ability for logical thinking to a variety of uses. He regularly enjoys the use of this new capacity; he enthusiastically plunges into discussions or dialectical debate; he gets a kick simply out of thinking, and enjoys juggling with ideas. As in other fields, in this area too he wants to experiment playfully, to explore just how far he can go on, to discover how ‘skilful’ he is. In the course of the present study we shall meet a number of illustrations from Roman antiquity. It might be opportune to illustrate this *Spieltrieb* by quoting here a text of Plato’s in which this phenomenon is exquisitely described. *A propos* of a discussion about the unity-multiplicity problem, Socrates says:

Any young man, when he first has an inkling of this, is delighted, thinking he has found a treasure of wisdom; his joy fills him with enthusiasm; he joyously sets every possible argument in motion, sometimes in one direction, rolling things up and kneading them into one, and sometimes again unrolling and dividing them; he gets himself into a muddle first and foremost, then anyone who happens to be near him, whether he be younger or older or of his own age; he spares neither father nor mother nor any human being who can hear, and hardly even the lower animals.⁴¹

And yet a young man does not always want to use his intellect as a (powerful) plaything. It is not only a source of joy. A youth will also employ his mind to get insight into his personal destiny. We shall meet quite a number of examples of this phenomenon in this study,

especially in the chapter on youth and philosophy. At this point we shall consider only the myth of Heracles at the crossroads and the allegorical letter Y, which symbolically represent this urge of youth.

‘When Heracles was passing from boyhood to youth’s estate, wherein the young, now becoming their own masters, show whether they will approach life by the path of virtue or the path of vice, he went out into a quiet place, and sat pondering which road to take.’ Thus begins in Xenophon the famous myth of Heracles at the crossroads, a story which found its way into Latin literature thanks to Cicero.⁴² While the young hero was lost in thought, two women approached him. The one, Virtue, was very simply dressed and was modesty itself. The other, Vice, was expensively dolled up and looked snooty and meretricious. Both approached Heracles and tried to win him over. The hero did not allow himself to be charmed by the tempting prattle of Vice but opted resolutely for the long, hard road of Virtue.

There is considerable resemblance between this myth and the symbolic representation of human life as the letter Y⁴³ attributed to Pythagoras. Initially the course of life is linear: a child is committed neither to virtue nor to vice, being restrained by the fear of his father or his teacher. At the dawn of adolescence (and logical thinking) every young man is confronted with a bifurcation and has a moment’s hesitation as to the life he would wish to lead. The path leading to the left is broad and easy, but leads to vice, to pleasure, to wastefulness, to idleness, and finally entails disgrace and utter misery. The path leading to the right, although steep, uneven and difficult, brings glory and peace of mind to those who reach the top. Virtue can only be reached at the expense of great effort, through the study of philosophy, and under the supervision of a wise guide.

In both the myth of Heracles and the allegorical Y the choice between good and evil is clearly situated at the inception of puberty.⁴⁴ Both tales seem to me to be symbols of a psychological reality. The young man at that period of life becomes aware of good and evil. He is unsure of himself, cuts himself off and seeks isolation (*exisse in solitudinem*) so as to reflect deeply and at length (*diu secum multumque dubitasse*) about his destiny and the best way of living: *utram viam ingredi melius est*.⁴⁵ He will often turn left and follow the road of passion, enjoyment and easy pleasure. Yet it is also possible that he will turn right and pledge himself with his whole heart to someone—or something—in which he believes.

Moral⁴⁶

It was the opinion of the ancients that youth primarily was *the* critical age of human life, a period of storm and stress, of tensions and conflicts. The young man, according to Horace, was ‘soft as wax for moulding to evil’,⁴⁷ his age was ‘suspect’⁴⁸ and a writer like Ps.-Plutarch illustrates it copiously:

I have often expressed my utter disapprobation of men [parents] who have been responsible for the introduction of depraved habits. For, while it is true that they have put attendants and teachers in charge of their children, they nevertheless have allowed the impetuosity of youth (*τῶν μαιρακίων ὁρμήν*) to range unrestrained, when they ought, on the contrary, to have exercised greater caution and watchfulness over them when they were young men than when they were children. For who is not aware that the faults of children are trivial and altogether corrigible—heedlessness, perhaps, towards their attendants, or deceiving and refusing to mind their teachers? But the iniquities of youth are often monstrous and wicked (*ὑπερφυᾶ καὶ σχέτλια*)—unlimited gluttony, theft of parents’ money, gambling, revels, drinking-bouts, love affairs with young girls, and corruption of married women. The impulses of young men should therefore be kept fettered and restrained by careful supervision. For life’s prime is prodigal in its pleasures, restive, and in need of a curb, so that parents who do not take hold of the reins with firm hand at this period of life, are manifestly, by their folly, giving to their sons licence for wrongdoing. Wise fathers ought, therefore, especially during this time (*παρὰ τοῦτον μάλιστα τὸν καιρόν*) to be vigilant and alert.⁴⁹

It comes as no surprise that Christian authors also stress the moral perils involved in growing up. For a Church Father like Ambrose there can be no doubt that *adulescentia* is the most critical age, whereas the other phases of life are much less ‘dangerous’. Childhood is the age of innocence, old age that of wisdom, and the adult takes care of his good name and feels ashamed of sin. ‘Only youth is weak of strength, feeble of insight, aglow with vice, averse to admonitions, an easy victim to refined pleasures.’⁵⁰ In the

Eastern world John Chrysostom's view of the matter is not positive either. He compares life to a sea. After having pointed out that during childhood the character is far from formed, with parents and teachers still standing in the wings, he continues:

After this age succeeds the ocean of youth, where the winds are violent as in the Aegean, lust increasing upon us. And this age especially is destitute of correction; not only because he is beset more fiercely, but also because his faults are not reprov'd, for both teacher and guide have now withdrawn. When therefore the winds blow more fiercely, and the pilot is more feeble, and there is no helper, consider the greatness of the tempest.⁵¹

Youth undoubtedly is a critical age. It is a stormy sea, an untamed animal, a sort of madness.⁵² In his defence of his youthful friend Caelius, Cicero compares human life to a racecourse. *Adulescentia* is the *flexus aetatis*, the dangerous corner in the course of human life. Just as at races in the circus where horses have problems negotiating the turning-point (*spina*) and often falter there, so too a youth will encounter temporary difficulties before he gets back on to the straight and narrow. It was the great orator's claim that this is exactly what happened to his client Caelius. His reputation was imperilled as a young man by his affair with the famous (and infamous) Clodia, by the fascination and the novelty of all sorts of passions exercised upon him. After that *intermezzo*, this young man will change his way of living and, as is so often the case, become a 'solid citizen'.

It is worth noting that in this context the normally severe Cicero is—or at least pretends to be—of the opinion that passions should be allowed to burn themselves out: 'After they [the passions] have been under somewhat long restraint and during early youth curbed and controlled [by educators], pleasures quite often suddenly break loose and burst out in a flood.' The great orator also points out that it is inevitable that a youth should suffer from all kinds of shortcomings, 'for many are the allurements to which nature of her own accord has given birth, such as can lull virtue to rest at times and cause her to relax her vigilance; she has put before the young many slippery paths (*multas vias adulescentiae lubricas*), on which they can scarcely keep their footing or even enter without falling or stumbling'.⁵³

It will be clear from this text how youth was considered as the ‘slippery’ age (*lubrica aetas, lubricum aetatis*). This expression, doubtless under the inspiration of Cicero, often keeps cropping up in references to youth, in both secular⁵⁴ and Christian⁵⁵ literature, and even in legal texts.⁵⁶

EDUCATORS—THE SEVERE AND THE SOFT-HEARTED⁵⁷

It will already be apparent that there could be divergent attitudes to the *lubricum aetatis*. On the one hand there were those like Ps.-Plutarch, whose views have just been outlined above, who condemned the sins of the young, the *vitia aetatis*,⁵⁸ in the strongest possible language, and believed that one had to take every possible step to keep this age-group in check and give them the guidance they required.⁵⁹ Even the humane Pliny was convinced that ‘the slippery age’ needs not only a teacher but also a supervisor, and even someone who will give a sense of direction to the youth’s life (*non praeceptor modo sed custos etiam rectorque*).⁶⁰

Normally people agreed that a young man needed guidance even after he had put on the adult toga.⁶¹ And yet people were generally tolerant and forgiving in their attitude to the shortcomings of the young. It was common to speak of the ‘sins’, ‘errors’, ‘slipping’, ‘game’, ‘jokes’ involved in being young.⁶² Parents should remember they had not behaved any better when they were young themselves.⁶³ It was indeed his age which led a youngster to slip,⁶⁴ and Cicero—and many with him—felt that no one would be such a spoil-sport as to deny a young man his kicks: *datur enim concessu omnium huic aliqui ludus aetati*.⁶⁵

Advocates of a ‘humane’ approach to the young were convinced that a number of the deficiencies of youth were not really malicious,⁶⁶ that they were part and parcel of being young, and thus perfectly normal and unavoidable,⁶⁷ that by provoking little or no reaction potential damage could be contained⁶⁸ and that ultimately the faults and failings of the young would correct themselves without an iron fist being applied.⁶⁹ After a while, when a young man has sown his wild oats, he is overcome with remorse, starts to apply commonsense and ends up on the straight and narrow again.⁷⁰ This was considered a ‘law of nature’. It was also an obligation for every youth sooner or later to conform to the standards of ‘the

establishment'. Thus Cicero again, who speaks as a barrister, of course, but certainly could not allow himself to talk nonsense:

Let some allowance be made to age; let youth be allowed greater freedom; let not pleasures always be forbidden; let not that upright and unbending reason always prevail; let desire and pleasure sometimes triumph over reason.... When he has listened to the voice of pleasure and given some time to love-affairs and these empty desires of youth (*ad ludum aetatis atque ad inanis hasce adulescentiae cupiditates*), let him at length turn to the interests of home life, to activity at the bar and in public affairs, so that all those pursuits the vanity of which reason had previously failed to reveal, he may show that he has abandoned from satiety and found contemptible through experience (*satietae abiecissee, experiendo contempsisse*).⁷¹

These words of Cicero's are rather remarkable. It is quite normal to stray from the right way as a young person and to find one's way back almost automatically without the 'crisis' necessarily doing any permanent damage. The eccentric behaviour of a young man appears as a sort of experimentation with different life-styles. A moment will be reached when enough is enough and the youngster will see that he has to mend his ways. He will capitulate to the 'establishment' and take up his duties as a father, politician or orator.

'The fault, which time has set up, time will take away', said the proverb.⁷² The best proof of this 'law of nature' is that many people had anything but an exemplary youth and grew up to become sound, even prominent citizens. Cicero once more:

I have indeed known and heard of many in this country who had not only taken a little sip of this kind of life, and touched it, as the proverb says, with the tips of their fingers, but who have given up their youth entirely to sensuality, who have at length risen to the surface and, as they say, turned over a new leaf (*se ad bonam frugem recepissee*)⁷³ and have become respectable and distinguished men (*gravisque homines atque inlustri*)..... Their failings were afterwards so covered over by numerous virtues, that anyone who wished could excuse them on the plea of youth (*adulescentiae excusatione*).⁷⁴

It was only to be expected that a young man should pass through a rather difficult and critical period while growing up. It has been seen how some people could be advanced beyond their years, how they could act like adults or old men even at a very early age. Such youngsters apparently did not pass through a 'dangerous' phase of life, but behaved in a way which defied what was generally expected of 'normal' juveniles. The exceptions, however, proved the rule, i.e. that youth was 'a slippery age', something one could regret or accept. It was extremely rare for the positive aspects of this phenomenon to be highlighted. Yet another passage from Cicero's plea in favour of Caelius is worth considering here. The famous advocate defends not only his friend's pursuit of luxury and amorous adventures—of such things people were generally rather tolerant—but above all else his ambition, thus casting the supremacy of the intellect in a relative light and pointing out the value of the transitional age that was (or at least could be) youth. An impetuous and turbulent youth could be evidence of a dynamic personality, a sign of great promise for the future.⁷⁵ The orator allows himself to be carried away by his affection for his client and friend, and -does his very best to have him acquitted. And yet the following words are not just barrister's bluff: it is the real Cicero we hear, as much as in the philosophical writings in which he ardently preaches the repression of all passions. In his peroration the advocate concedes that Caelius has not always behaved as one might have wished, and continues:

I am not speaking about [Caelius'] good sense, a quality which does not belong to his years; I am speaking about his impetuosity, his eagerness to win, his ardent desire for glory. Such passions, in men who have reached our time of life, ought to be somewhat restrained, but in youth, as with wild plants, they give promise of what virtue in its ripeness and how great the fruits of industry will some day be. Why, young men of great talent always need to be checked rather than encouraged in the quest of distinction; youth is an age when, if it is beginning to display exuberance in its intellectual gifts, pruning rather than grafting is needed.⁷⁶ Wherefore, if anyone thinks that Caelius' energy, spirit, obstinacy, either in beginning or in carrying on his enmities, have been too ardent (*nimum efferbuisse*), or if any of even these trifles give some offence, his shade of purple, his hosts of friends, his sparkle,

his brilliance—all this feverishness, you will find, will soon have cooled down (*iam ista deferbuerint*);⁷⁷ age, experience and time will have mellowed all (*iam aetas omnia, iam res, iam dies mitigarit*).⁷⁸

WHY WAS YOUTH REPUTEDLY SO LACKING IN VIRTUE?⁷⁹

Youth is the *lubricum aetatis*, the crisis period of human life. How did the ancients explain this fact? A distinction must be drawn between the influence of surroundings and purely internal developments, factors which flow from the specific mental, physical, psychological and emotional attributes of an adolescent.

Social factors⁸⁰

Roman antiquity was well aware of the influence of society on youth. There was a general acknowledgement that the ‘crisis’ which so many of the young normally went through could be explained by environmental factors. *Adulescentia* began with the assumption of the adult toga (*toga virilis*); it ended with the inauguration of a political career and/or marriage. The one brought with it freedom and leisure, the other distinguished responsibility. Apart from these elements there were further social factors which could influence the intensity of the crisis in varying degrees.

*Freedom—the most serious danger*⁸¹

The Romans themselves linked the beginning of the crisis period with assuming the adult toga and the freedom which from that time on became the young man’s privilege.⁸²

Not everyone was quite so shy about this new acquisition as Persius. This young poet remembers how he had once laid aside the *toga praetexta* and the *bullae*, custodians of his childhood years, and had donned the adult toga, not without a certain trepidation (*mihi pavidō*). He was now free from his pedagogue and allowed to wander round the Subura area—notorious for its ladies of easy virtue—together with his charming friends (*blandi comites*). He did not know, however, what to do with his newfound freedom and, ill at ease (*trepidās mentes*), he stood at the crossroads of his life⁸³ and saw a new world open before him. Looking for something or

somebody to hold on to, he threw himself completely and unconditionally on Cornutus (*me tibi seposui*), a Stoic philosopher in whom he found a true guide and mentor.⁸⁴

Most youths, doubtless, were less timid than Persius. For many, a rather negative chapter in their personal development opened with the assumption of the toga. ‘Whom hath not unrestrained youth (*pubes effrena*) corrupted, and the too hasty freedom of the gown (*novaeque libertas properata togae*)’, cried a young man in a poem of Statius.⁸⁵ The fact that many were not in a fit state to integrate this newfound freedom is eloquently brought out by the words with which Plutarch introduces his tract ‘On Listening to Lectures’, a treatise written for the young Nicander, who had just reached adulthood:

[I send you this tract] so that you may know how rightly to listen to the voice of persuasion, now that you are no longer subject to authority, having assumed the male toga (*τὸ ἀνδρεῖον ἱμάτιον*). Now absence of control, which some of the young men, for want of education, think to be freedom, establishes the sway of a set of masters, harsher than the teachers and attendants of childhood, in the form of the desires, which are now, as it were, unchained.... As soon as they lay aside the garb of childhood, they lay aside also their sense of modesty and fear, and, undoing the habit that invests them, straightway become full of unruliness. But you have often heard that to follow God and to obey reason are the same thing, and so I ask you to believe that in persons of good sense the passing from childhood to manhood is not a casting off of control, but a recasting of the controlling agent, since instead of some hired person or slave purchased with money they now take as the divine guide of their life reason, whose followers alone may deservedly be considered free.⁸⁶

The young man’s freedom was more often than not strictly limited as long as his father lived. When the latter died on the eve of his son’s puberty, the dangers to which a lad was exposed were particularly great. This fact is clearly illustrated by the rhetorical description the Syrian Herodian (second century) gives us of the concern which the dying Marcus Aurelius felt about what might happen to his son Commodus after his death. The emperor was afraid that the youth ‘would grow up in control of absolute, unchecked power without

parental authority' and—as a result— might devote his time to drunken debauchery and a life of pleasure, for 'young men's passions are easily diverted from learning moral values'. Marcus remembered a whole series of young emperors—Nero, for instance—who abused their power in a scandalous fashion. Now that he was on his death-bed he called all his confidants together and asked them to be particularly attentive to his son who was now at such a difficult age: 'Here is my son, whom you yourself brought up, who has just reached the age of adolescence and stands in need of guides through the tempest and storm of life (*ἄρτι τῆς μεираκίων ἡλικίας ἐπιβαίνοντα καί . . . ὥσπερ ἐν χειμῶνι καὶ ζάλῃ*). There is a danger that he will be carried away and dashed against the rock of evil habits because he has an imperfect experience of what to do.'⁸⁷

*Other factors which influenced the crisis*⁸⁸

At the beginning of this study it was seen how certain laws which came into effect around 200 BC—the *Lex Plaetoria* and the *Lex Villia annalis*—provided for a sort of 'bridge' between the years of childhood and full adulthood, between physical and social maturity.⁸⁹ Thus one can say that Roman legislation allowed youth to benefit from being young.

When the shock of the second Punic War (218–201 BC) had become a thing of the past, Rome was inundated with Greek culture, particularly after the battle of Pydna (168 BC). The new capital of the world reached a hitherto unknown level of prosperity. It goes without saying that the new situation deeply influenced the youth of the day. This is evidenced through the following testimony from the historian Polybius, who, after having described the young Scipio's exemplary behaviour,⁹⁰ contrasts it with the excesses of most young people in those days, for which he gives a penetrating explanation:

For some of them had abandoned themselves to amours with boys and others to the society of courtesans, and many to musical entertainments and banquets, and the extravagance they involve, having in the course of the war with Perseus been speedily infected by the Greek laxity in these respects. So great in fact was the incontinence that had broken out among the young men (*ἀκρασία τοῖς νέοις*) in such matters, that many paid a talent for a male favourite and many three

hundred drachmas for a jar of caviar.... It was just at the period we are treating of that this present tendency to extravagance declared itself, first of all because they thought that now after the fall of the Macedonian kingdom their universal dominion was undisputed, and next because after the riches of Macedonia had been transported to Rome there was a great display of wealth both in public and in private.⁹¹

The 'crisis' which marked the adolescence of many youths was a side-effect of a flourishing society. This partially explains why it was especially the youngsters of the city,⁹² and not so much those from villages or the countryside,⁹³ who went through this troublesome phase of life, and why even within urban centres this phenomenon was mainly confined to youngsters from the leisured classes. The Ancients were only too well aware of this fact. A lad from a wealthy background was allowed far more than a contemporary of lower social rank, who was inserted into the economic process at an early age and simply never had the chance to abandon himself to the *vitia fortunae*. Nicolaus of Damascus makes this clear, saying that the young Augustus behaved in an exemplary fashion 'at the very age at which youths, particularly those of wealth (*μᾶλλον οἱ εὐτχεῖς*) are most wanton (*μάλιστα σφριγῶσιν*).'⁹⁴

A youngster's milieu shapes his way of being young in no uncertain manner. An important explanation for the eccentric behaviour of many youths lies in the fact that they enjoyed a great deal of free time (*otium*). As soon as the great wars were over, most young men of rank did not feel attracted to the army,⁹⁵ and they had to wait until they were 25 or 30 before they could enjoy their full rights in civil law or be given political responsibility. They had thus a great deal of free time and every opportunity to develop their own life-style. The *otium*, the leisure, the living for himself, free from the burdens of public responsibilities, appears often as a major explanation of the troubles which were so characteristic of a young person's growing years.⁹⁶ A young man like Catullus was all too aware that his *otium* was very likely to cause his ruin: 'Idleness, Catullus, does you harm, you riot in your idleness and wanton too much. Idleness ere now has ruined both kings and wealthy cities.'⁹⁷

The intensity of a particular youth's crisis years also depended greatly on the education he had received as a child, on the way he had been reared as a young man. The ancients were aware that by undue severity parents could put the filial affection of their children

at risk: 'There his children hold a sire's life cheap where rather feared than honoured he would be (*ubi malunt metui quam vereri se ab suzs*)';⁹⁸ yet they saw at the same time that an over-lax upbringing inevitably led to a fiasco. Thus, for example, a father in the Elder Seneca came to realize that he himself was entirely responsible for the misbehaviour of his son: 'He was too indulgently brought up; he thinks he may do anything; he has never asked me anything.'⁹⁹

The 'slippery age' was bound to be affected by the people with whom a young man associated. Older people—especially flatterers—could be 'bad company',¹⁰⁰ and Christian writers even went so far as to advise the young to avoid the company of their peers and to associate with virtuous people who were older.¹⁰¹

'When seniors blunder, juniors learn but ill.'¹⁰² It was the Romans' view that not only parents but all elders should set the young a good example. Their behaviour, however, was often anything but exemplary, and this fact was, in Cicero's view, disastrous for the young: 'Luxury, a vice in any time of life, is in old age especially scandalous. But if excess in sensual indulgence is added to luxurious living, it is a twofold evil; for old age not only disgraces itself; it also serves to make the excesses of the young more shameless (*facit adulescentium impudentiorem intemperantiam*)'.¹⁰³ Probably the worst fact of all was that many older people simply did not dare to exercise their responsibilities as educators: they were terrified by the young, found excuses for their shortcomings, did not dare upbraid them, desired to accommodate themselves at every turn. These are precisely the attitudes that Laelius, following in Plato's footsteps,¹⁰⁴ complains about in Cicero's *Republic*:

The father fears his son, the son flouts his father, all sense of shame disappears, and all is so absolutely free that there is no distinction between citizen and alien; the schoolmaster fears and flatters his pupils, and pupils despise their masters; youths take on the gravity of age, and old men stoop to the games of youth (*ludus adulescentium*), for fear they may be disliked by their juniors and seem to them too serious (*ne sint iis odiosi et graves*).¹⁰⁵

*Factors which helped end the crisis period*¹⁰⁶

Freedom, money, leisure—with the onset of puberty the young man came into a strange, new world which he wished to explore and then become used to.¹⁰⁷ A poor upbringing and bad example set by his elders did not help make things easier for him. After a time, however, his ‘awkward age’ would be a thing of the past. Marriage and the pursuit of a political career could help him to put the past behind him.

Marriage¹⁰⁸

Roman girls of the well-to-do classes married at a (very) early age (mostly between 12 and 15) but most males were much older (on average nine years older) at marriage,¹⁰⁹—if they married at all. From this point of view, they had the chance to be young. But all good things come to an end.

Throughout Roman antiquity marriage was viewed as a sign of frugality (*frugalitas*). This fact emerges clearly from the comedies of Terence and Plautus, whose plots often hinge on the love of a youth for a girl whose status makes marriage impossible. The father does not bother initially to object to his son’s love-affair; yet he does expect his son, when the day comes, to swap his dearly beloved for a ‘worthy’ spouse. The youngster is far from enthusiastic, but then something happens which virtually never happened in reality: it transpires that the girl is of good family and a love-match is possible.

In Terence’s *The Brothers*, a father is under the illusion that his son has been reconciled to the inevitable marriage and that his youthful pranks are at an end: ‘At last, only the other day, weary, I suppose, of them all he announced a desire to marry. I hoped his hot blood had cooled down (*defervisse*).’¹¹⁰ In the same comedian’s *The Lady of Andros* young Pamphilus is of the opinion that his father, Simo, is unreasonable and wants to bind him to a lawful wife at too early an age: ‘Father’, he says, ‘you have yourself fixed the time for these things to end; the day is at hand when I must suit my life to another’s way (*alieno more*); till then let me live my own (*meo modo*).’ Simo was not at all put out by the fact that his son had made the best of his youth. Yet he did feel that the time had now come for the lad to start thinking about settling down. Davos, the slave, tried to convince his master that Pamphilus had reconciled himself to the paternal wish: ‘In fact he has reckoned it in his own

mind on the right lines.... So long as he might, so long as his years suited it (*dum licitum est ei dumque aetas tulit*), he had a love-affair. What's more he kept it dark. He was careful that the incident shouldn't ever spoil his good name, as a man of character ought. Now it's time he took a wife, and to a wife he has turned his thoughts.' Simo was, of course, hearing what he wanted to hear, but in fact his son had no desire whatever to swap his girl-friend for a perfect stranger. Daddy now tries to use a supposed tiff between the lovers to force a wife on his son. He addresses his friend Chremes, father of the candidate wife, in the following words: 'Let us give him a wife. I hope that the tie of association and marriage with a gentlewoman will make it easy for my son to escape from this sea of evil.' Chremes initially agrees, yet is quick to regret his promise: 'You have driven me, when there was a young man preoccupied in a love-affair, averse from matrimony, to agree to his marrying my daughter, a plunge into discord and unstable wedlock, that her trouble and her pain might be the drug to cure your son (*gnato ut medicarer tuo*)'.¹¹¹

Marriage often had—or was supposed to have—a 'curative' effect. This was a general conviction, and it was not only in the theatre that one could hear such words. Cicero's daughter Tullia married Dolabella. The orator was not terribly enthusiastic about that marriage, arranged as it was by mother and daughter, but he banked on Dolabella improving under Tullia's influence.¹¹² Statius relates a story about a young man who stopped misbehaving once he married: he embraced the married state eagerly and willingly and happily submitted to the reins (*frena*) of matrimony.¹¹³ At the close of antiquity, St Augustine was disconcerted by the fact that his parents during his early youth were only interested in his studies and did not compel him to marry, thus putting an end once and for all to his turbulent youth (*ut usque ad coniugale litus exaestuarent fluctus aetatis meae*).¹¹⁴

One thing is clear: Romans perceived marriage as putting a damper on a dissolute life. It put an end to the freedom and libertine life-style of a young man. People like Terence believed that with marriage another life (*alia vita*) began, that new morals (*alii mores*) were embraced then and that a young man ended up on the strait and narrow (*redire in viam*).¹¹⁵ Ps.-Plutarch saw marriage as the best remedy for 'hopeless cases': 'An effort should be made to yoke in marriage those who cannot resist their desires, and who are deaf to admonitions. For marriage is the most secure bond for youth

(δεσμός γὰρ οὗτος τῆς νεότητος ἀσφαλ- ἐστάτος).¹¹⁶ The patristic writers were of the same opinion and held it even more strongly than their pagan counterparts. They were extremely apprehensive about the ‘youthful passions’ and for that very reason insisted on early marriage for all, boys included. John Chrysostom, for example, writes how passions erupt with a virulent intensity at the age of 15 and are very difficult to keep under control. Therefore, he says, ‘if you do bring your son up to the secular life, introduce his bride to him straightway and do not wait for him to be a soldier or engage in political life before you do so.... Bind him then with this fetter, the fetter that makes virtue secure. Then, even if he cannot have a wife from his earliest manhood, let him have a betrothed from the first and let him strive to show himself a good man.’¹¹⁷

Going into politics¹¹⁸

The fact of having a real profession evidently reduces the chances of being ‘really’ young. For Roman upper-class youths, careers in the army and/or politics were traditionally the main options. That a period in the army accelerated the attaining of maturity is evident, and explicitly attested in the case of Marius.¹¹⁹ Offices in the army, however, became less and less attractive for aristocratic youths from c. 200 BC on.¹²⁰ The same cannot be said about politics, at least during the Republic.

In those days, virtually every youngster of rank dreamt of a political career. Originally there was no minimum age for entry into the political arena and one was deemed qualified from the time of assuming the adult toga.¹²¹ As we have seen above, the *Lex Villia annalis* changed all that, and thenceforth a youth had to wait far into his twenties before he could start his *cursus honorum*. When commenting upon this law, Cicero declared that it was implemented out of fear of ‘the rashness of youth’, *adulescentiae temeritas*.¹²² Pacatus, a fourth-century Gallic panegyrist, found it—in his rhetorical style—a most sensible rule, because

even people who [as adults] followed the path of virtue staggered or even fell on the slippery paths of youth (*lubricum aetatis*). Has riotous living (*luxuria*) not claimed the most famous men of Rome for some time—I mean a Sulla, a Catullus, a Scipio? Although more favourable winds brought them to a

safe haven, they were once drowning and shipwrecked young men rolled back and forth by the hurricanes of passions till their age (*aetas*) freed them—not easily!—from the extravagances which threatened to submerge them.¹²³

‘Lads and young men (*τὰ μεράκια καὶ τοὺς νέους*) are turned away from public affairs by those who are wise’.¹²⁴ These words were no ‘wishful thinking’ on the part of Plutarch. They correspond to reality in Greek¹²⁵ as well as Roman society. The Romans (and Greeks) had a healthy fear of a young man’s ambition, rashness, audacity, impetuosity, arrogance, insolence, inexperience,¹²⁶ and were thus reluctant to entrust serious civil and political responsibilities to him. It is clear, however, that precisely for that reason—because a youngster was not normally considered a ‘finished product’ and taken seriously—tensions were created and a juvenile might try to affirm himself in a less than desirable way. It is my view that the ancients were not sufficiently aware of this link, that they were rarely alerted to the fact that the *lubrica aetas* was to a large extent the consequence of the fact that young men were insufficiently involved in private and public ‘official’ life and could not hold important responsibilities. The volte-face which marked the latter years of many youths is usually just observed as a neutral fact.¹²⁷ If an explanation is offered, reference is made to age (*aetas*)¹²⁸ or to ‘saturation’ and ‘getting sense’.¹²⁹

It was generally believed that a young man simply could not bear the burden of responsibility at too early an age. An exceptional case occurs in the history of Dio Cassius, where the candidacy of a young man (probably Scipio Aemilianus) for an important office receives backing. Reference is made here to the fact that youths were disappointed because responsible offices were refused them.¹³⁰ After pointing out that one should not exaggerate the question of age, the speaker continues:

Do not discourage the young men through the idea that they are disqualified from performing any services. On the contrary, you ought to urge them to practise zealously the performance of all the duties that belong to them, and to look for both honours and offices even before they reach old age. For by this course you will render their elders better, too—first, by confronting them with many competitors, and next by making it clear that you are going to establish, not length of

years, but innate excellence (οὐκ ἐξ ἀριθμοῦ ἐτῶν ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀρετῆς ἐμφύτου) as the test in conferring honours, and particularly positions of command, upon any citizens.¹³¹

Internal factors¹³²

The transition from childhood with its dependence and lack of responsibility to the independence and responsibility of adulthood went hand in hand with tensions and conflicts, with 'storm and stress'. A whole range of sociological factors may offer a partial explanation for this phenomenon. The youngster was, however, threatened, as it were, from within also. In his psyche there lay a sort of tension between logical thought, which was beginning to develop but had not yet taken firm root—from this point of view youth especially was an *infirma, imbecilla, immatura aetas*¹³³—and the turbulence of all kinds of irrational urges.

There are numerous texts in which mention is made of the 'passions', 'pleasures' and 'impulses' (*libidines, voluptates, motus, impetus*) which make it difficult for a young man to have balanced judgement and live virtuously.¹³⁴ As we read again and again, he is driven and propelled by the ardour or fervour (*ardor, calor, fervor*) of youth,¹³⁵ or by his age itself (*aetas*).¹³⁶ As is only to be expected, Christian writers were even more vivid and expressive in their descriptions of 'youthful passions' than pagan authors. The following quotation from the bishop Ambrose is typical:

Who can deny, then, that adolescence and even the early years of manhood (*adulescentiam et ipsam in exordiis iuventutem*) are subject to the temptations of the passions? Who can deny, too, that, when a more mature age (*maturior aetas*) is reached, peace returns after the tempestuous yearnings of youth are passed (*tamquam pubescentis lasciviae tempestate discussa*) and the wearied soul finds at last a mooring place in some secluded harbour of life? So the turbulent emotions of youth (*graves motus adulescentiae*) are calmed down by faithful old age.¹³⁷

And in the East, someone like John Chrysostom was just as negative as his Milanese colleague: 'Imagine the nature of youth, especially youth at its acme. The fire of nature (τῆς φύσεως ἡ φλόξ) burns in

all vehemence, passions rage furiously (*ὁ χειμὼν τῶν παθῶν*) and reason is extremely weak.¹³⁸

An adult was usually credited with acting according to reason, while a young man was said to be driven by the irrational. The strong emotional element in youth was seen as linked with the constitution of the body, with its strength, with the warmth of blood, and—although rarely and only in late antiquity—with the physiological changes of puberty.¹³⁹

Augustine in his *Confessions* clearly connects the beginning of his troubled youth with puberty (*scatebra pubertatis*),¹⁴⁰ and in one of his letters Jerome writes about the spurs and provocations of youth, or rather of puberty (*adulescentiae, immo pubertatis incentiva*).¹⁴¹ More often we read how the passion erupts angrily with great violence because the young body is so sturdy. Thus Jerome: ‘Youth has to endure many conflicts with the body, and amid incentives to vice and titillations of the flesh, it is stifled, as a fire is when it is fed with green wood and cannot display its proper brightness’. ‘If even without wine I am all aglow, if I feel the fire of youth and am inflamed by hot blood (*calore sanguinis*), if I am of a strong and lusty habit of body...’¹⁴² And Ambrose: ‘What would lust be if the flesh did not set it afire? It cools off in the elderly, as it does in children, because their body is weak. But it burns in the young in whom bodily strength flows effervescently (*ardet in adolescentibus in quibus vis corporis fervet*)’.¹⁴³

‘Hot bloodedness’ appears in Jerome’s text, as is so often the case,¹⁴⁴ as the cause of a young man’s turbulent passions.¹⁴⁵ Plutarch shares this view and interprets the phenomenon in a philosophical way. Soul and body are one, and as proof he refers to the impulses (*αἱ ὁρμαὶ*) which arise and relax together with the changes of the body:

For this reason young men are swift and impetuous and fiery in their appetites, and stung by madness, as it were, through the abundance and heat of their blood; but in old men the source of desire, which is seated about the liver, is in the process of being extinguished and becoming small and weak, whereas reason increases more and more in vigour as the passionate element fades away together with the body.

Similar ideas are to be found elsewhere in the same author, where reference is made also to the influence of the ‘pneuma’ (a mixture of the elements fire and air) which animates all:

Desire is at its height in the young, dejection in old men. The reason is that the former have a hot constitution of their blood, and a tempestuous spirit (*πνεῦμα*) for their actions, and a body, too, to serve them that is always in tune, with organs unblemished and uncontaminated; their strong pulse excites and fans their desires, which take fire from the flow of blood as it were from fresh fuel. As a result we see the young man subject to many a change in his impulses.¹⁴⁶

A PSYCHOLOGICAL PORTRAIT¹⁴⁷

It is probably to be expected that the young are casually characterized by a number of largely unflattering features. Before discussing such data, let us consider some systematic ‘portraits’ which show youth in confrontation with other age-groups.

Descriptions of the human life-span¹⁴⁸

Only a few descriptions of the human life-span as a whole have come down to us from antiquity. Most famous is the tripartite division of Aristotle, but we also have a four-part division by Horace and one into seven ages by the Egyptian astrologer Ptolemy. Most important for this study is Horace. Nevertheless I shall quote Aristotle and Ptolemy too, because their characterizations of the human life-span can help us to understand Roman youths better and to place them in a broader context.

The ages of man according to a Greek philosopher:

*Aristotle*¹⁴⁹

Working on the basis of one of the fundamental principles of his philosophy, i.e. that what is best is always the *via media* between extremes, Aristotle distinguishes three ages in his *Art of Rhetoric*. Just as courage is situated half-way between recklessness and cowardice, so maturity as the best age is situated between youth (described rather positively) and old age (seen very negatively):

12. With regard to character, the young (*οἱ νέοι*) are ready to desire and to carry out what they desire. Of the bodily desires they chiefly obey those of sensual pleasure, and these they are unable to control. Changeable in their desires and soon tiring of them, they desire with extreme ardour, but soon cool; for their will, like the hunger and thirst of the sick, is keen rather than strong. They are passionate, hot-tempered, and carried away by impulse, and unable to control their passion; for owing to their ambition they cannot endure to be slighted, and become indignant when they think they are being wronged. They are ambitious of honour, but more so of victory; for youth desires superiority, and victory is a kind of superiority. And their desire for both these is greater than their desire for money, to which they attach only the slightest value, because they have never yet experienced want, as Pittacus said in his pithy remark on Amphiaraus. They are not ill-natured but simple-natured, because they have never yet witnessed much depravity; confiding, because they have as yet not been often deceived; full of hope, for they are naturally as hot-blooded as those who are drunken with wine, and besides they have not yet experienced many failures. For the most part they live in hope, for hope is concerned with the future as memory is with the past. For the young the future is long, the past short; for in the morning of life it is not possible for them to remember anything, but they have everything to hope; which makes them easy to deceive, for they readily hope. And they are more courageous, for they are full of passions and hope, and the former of these prevents them fearing, while the latter inspires them with confidence, for no one fears when angry, and hope of some advantage inspires confidence. And they are bashful, for as yet they fail to conceive of other things that are noble, but have been educated solely by convention. They are high-minded, for they have not yet been humbled by life nor have they experienced the force of necessity; further, there is highmindedness in thinking oneself worthy of great things, a feeling which belongs to one who is full of hope. In their actions, they prefer the noble to the useful; their life is guided by their character rather than by calculation, for the latter aims at the useful, virtue at the noble. At this age more than at any other they are fond of their friends and companions, because they take pleasure in living in company and as yet judge nothing by

expediency, not even their friends. All their errors are due to excess and vehemence and their neglect of the maxim of Chilon, for they do everything to excess, love, hate, and everything else. And they think they know everything, and confidently affirm it, and this is the cause of their excess in everything. If they do wrong, it is due to insolence, not to wickedness. And they are inclined to pity, because they think all men are virtuous and better than themselves; for they measure their neighbours by their own inoffensiveness, so that they think that they suffer undeservedly. And they are fond of laughter, and therefore witty; for wit is cultured insolence. Such then is the character of the young.

13. **Older men** and those who have passed their prime (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ παρηκμακότες*) have in most cases characters opposite to those of the young. For, owing to their having lived many years and having been more often deceived by others or made more mistakes themselves, and since most human things turn out badly, they are positive about nothing, and in everything they show an excessive lack of energy. They always 'think', but 'know' nothing; and in their hesitation they always add 'perhaps', or 'maybe'; all their statements are of this kind, never unqualified. They are malicious; for malice consists in looking upon the worst side of everything. Further, they are always suspicious owing to mistrust, and mistrustful owing to experience. And neither their love nor their hatred is strong for the same reasons; but, according to the precept of Bias, they love as if they would one day hate, and hate as if they would one day love. And they are little-minded, because they have been humbled by life; for they desire nothing great or uncommon, but only the necessities of life. They are not generous, for property is one of these necessities, and, at the same time, they know from experience how hard it is to get and how easy to lose. And they are cowardly and inclined to anticipate evil, for their state of mind is the opposite of that of the young; they are chilled, whereas the young are hot, so that old age paves the way for cowardice, for fear is a kind of chill. And they are fond of life, especially in their last days, because desire is directed towards that which is absent and men especially desire what they lack. And they are unduly selfish, for this also is littleness of mind. And they live not for the noble, but for the useful, more than

they ought, because they are selfish; for the useful is a good for the individual, whereas the noble is good absolutely. And they are rather shameless than modest; for since they do not care for the noble so much as for the useful, they pay little attention to what people think. And they are little given to hope owing to their experience, for things that happen are mostly bad and at all events generally turn out for the worse, and also owing to their cowardice. They live in memory rather than in hope; for the life that remains to them is short, but that which is past is long, and hope belongs to the future, memory to the past. This is the reason of their loquacity; for they are incessantly talking of the past, because they take pleasure in recollection. Their outbursts of anger are violent, but feeble; of their desires some have ceased, while others are weak, so that they neither feel them nor act in accordance with them, but only from motives of gain. Hence men of this age are regarded as self-controlled, for their desires have slackened, and they are slaves to gain. In their manner of life there is more calculation than moral character, for calculation is concerned with that which is useful, moral character with virtue. If they commit acts of injustice it is due to vice rather than to insolence. The old, like the young, are inclined to pity, but not for the same reason; the latter show pity from humanity, the former from weakness, because they think that they are on the point of suffering all kinds of misfortunes, and this is one of the reasons that incline men to pity. That is why the old are querulous, and neither witty nor fond of laughter; for a querulous disposition is the opposite of a love of laughter. Such are the characters of the young and older men....

14. It is evident that the character of **those in the prime of life** (*οἱ ἀκμάζοντες*) will be the mean between that of the other two, if the excess in each case be removed. At this age, men are neither over-confident, which would show rashness, nor too fearful, but preserving a right attitude in regard to both, neither trusting nor distrusting all, but judging rather in accordance with actual facts. Their rule of conduct is neither the noble nor the useful alone, but both at once. They are neither parsimonious nor prodigal, but preserve the due mean. It is the same in regard to passion and desire. Their self-control is combined with courage and their courage with self-control, whereas in the young and old these qualities are found

separately; for the young are courageous but without self-control, the old are self-controlled but cowardly. Speaking generally, all the advantages that youth and old age possess separately, those in the prime of life possess combined; and all cases of excess or defect in the other two are replaced by due moderation and fitness. The body is most fully developed from thirty to thirty-five years of age, the mind at about forty-nine.

*The ages of man according to an Egyptian
astrologer: Ptolemy*¹⁵⁰

Aristotle distinguished three ages of man: youth, adulthood, old age. Yet the most common view held in ancient Greece was that of man's life as divided into seven ages (or phases of one or more hebdomads).¹⁵¹ We find such a sevenfold division in Ptolemy, the famous astrologer of the second century AD. Each age is linked to a planet. Youth appears here as the age between childhood and young adulthood; it lasts from 14 until the age of 22 and is connected with Venus.

0–4: Up to about the fourth year, following the number which belongs to the quadrennium, the moon takes over the age of **infancy** (*τὴν τοῦ βρέφους ἡλικίαν*) and produces the suppleness and lack of fixity in its body, its quick growth and the moist nature, as a rule, of its food, the changeability of its condition, and the imperfection and inarticulate state of its soul, suitable to her own active qualities.

4–14: In the following period of ten years, Mercury, to whom falls the second place and the second age, that of **childhood** (*τὴν παιδικὴν ἡλικίαν*) for the period which is half of the space of twenty years, begins to articulate and fashion the intelligent and logical part of the soul, to implant certain seeds and rudiments of learning, and to bring to light individual peculiarities of character and faculties, awaking the soul at this stage by instruction, tutelage, and the first gymnastic exercises.

14–22: Venus, taking in charge the third age, that of **youth** (*τὴν μεираκιώδη ἡλικίαν*) for the next eight years, corresponding in number to her own period, begins, as is natural, to inspire, at their maturity, an activity of the seminal passages and to implant an impulse toward the

embrace of love. At this time particularly a kind of frenzy enters the soul, incontinence, desire for any chance sexual gratification, burning passion, guile, and the blindness of the impetuous lover.

22–41: The lord of the middle sphere, the sun, takes over the fourth age, which is the middle one in order, **young manhood** (*ἡλικίαν τὴν νεανικήν*) for the period of nineteen years, wherein he implants in the soul at length the mastery and direction of its actions, desire for substance, glory, and position, and a change from playful, ingenuous error to seriousness, decorum, and ambition.

41–56: After the sun, Mars, fifth in order, assumes command of manhood (*τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἀνδρῶδες*) for the space of fifteen years, equal to his own period. He introduces severity and misery into life, and implants cares and troubles in the soul and in the body, giving it, as it were, some sense and notion of passing its prime and urging it, before it approaches its end, by labour to accomplish something among its undertakings that is worthy of note.

56–68: Sixth, Jupiter, taking as his lot the **elderly age** (*τὴν πρεσβυτικὴν ἡλικίαν*) again for the space of his own period, twelve years, brings about the renunciation of manual labour, toil, turmoil, and dangerous activity, and in their place brings decorum, foresight, retirement, together with all-embracing deliberation, admonition, and consolation; now especially he brings men to set store by honour, praise, and independence, accompanied by modesty and dignity.

68- : Finally, to Saturn falls as his lot **old age** (*τὴν γεροντικὴν ἡλικίαν*) the latest period, which lasts for the rest of life. Now the movements both of body and of soul are cooled and impeded in their impulses, enjoyments, desires, and speed; for the natural decline supervenes upon life, which has become worn down with age, dispirited, weak, easily offended, and hard to please in all situations, in keeping with the sluggishness of his movements.

The ages of man according to a Roman poet:

Horace¹⁵²

The only description of the human life-span in Roman literature is to be found in Horace. Unlike Aristotle and Ptolemy, who

distinguish respectively three and seven ages, the famous Roman poet gives a description of four *aetates*: childhood, youth, adulthood and old age.

You must note the manners of each age, and give a befitting tone to shifting natures and their years.

The child (*puer*), who by now can utter words and set firm step upon the ground, delights to play with his mates, flies into a passion and as lightly puts it aside, and changes every hour.

The beardless youth (*inberbus iuuenis*), freed at last from his tutor, finds joy in horses and hounds and the grass of the sunny Campus, soft as wax for moulding to evil, peevish with his counsellors, slow to make needful provision, lavish of money, spirited, of strong desires, but swift to change his fancies.

With altered aims, the age and spirit of **the man** (*aetas virilis*) seeks wealth and friends, becomes a slave to ambition, and is fearful of having done what soon it will be eager to change.

Many ills encompass an **old man** (*senex*), whether because he seeks gain, and then miserably holds aloof from his store and fears to use it, because, in all that he does, he lacks fire and courage, is dilatory and slow to form hopes, is sluggish and greedy of a longer life, peevish, surly, given to praising the days he spent as a boy, and to reproving and condemning the young.

Many blessings do the advancing years bring with them; many, as they retire, they take away. So, lest haply we assign a youth the part of age, or a boy that of manhood, we shall ever linger over traits that are joined and fitted to the age.

The main characteristics of the youthful psyche¹⁵³

Many characteristics of youth have already been mentioned above. The vigour of all sorts of irrational forces is a main cause of the *lubrica aetas* a young man usually experiences. There is often talk of the passions, the flow, the fire, the impulses of youth, of 'storm' and 'fermentation'.¹⁵⁴ Thus a young man is characterized, for example in Cicero's works, by his hot-headedness (*ferocitas*),¹⁵⁵ doubtless the most characteristic feature of youth in general. As a result mainly of irrational tendencies and inner strife, a young man is easily led

astray. He is, as Horace says, 'soft as wax for moulding to evil (*cereus in vitium flecti*),¹⁵⁶ he does not know measure, wants to be free in everything he does, misuses his freedom and wants to draw attention by his shamelessness. 'A child', says Ambrose, 'sins because it is weak, a youth (*iuuenis*) because he is depraved. Eagerly he desires to sin, and he boasts of his misdeeds, for most of them regard innocence as cowardice, guilt as an honour. Young men are proud mostly of their luxury, their pleasure-seeking, their adulteries.'¹⁵⁷

Opposed to the steadfastness of the adult we find the capriciousness of the adolescent, who is, as Horace says, 'of strong desires, but swift to change his fancies (*cupidusque et amata relinquere pernix*)'.¹⁵⁸ 'His youthful ardour', we read in Ps.-Seneca's *Octavia*, 'burns fiercely in its initial stages (*iuuenilis ardor impetu primo furit*), but is soon and easily extinguished (*languescit idem facile nec durat diu*)'.¹⁵⁹ A quiet and well-ordered life, says Pliny, does older men honour, but not so much the young, in whom 'a certain amount of confusion and irregularity (*confusa quaedam et quasi turbata*)' are not misplaced.¹⁶⁰ Augustine speaks of the unrest of youth, the *inquieta adulescentia*,¹⁶¹ a phenomenon which he describes in a masterly fashion in his *Confessions*, and which was also experienced by the Christian poet Commodian when he was young: 'Unknowing I wandered and roamed about, gripped by an idle hope. The ardour of my tender youth (*furor aetatis primae*) bore me, lighter than a straw, to the clouds. It was as if a hundred heads were on my shoulders, so I was propelled headlong in all directions.'¹⁶²

Although Horace attributes ambition to the adult,¹⁶³ for whom it is a duty, it is at least as characteristic in a youth, in whose case it is not greatly appreciated as a rule.¹⁶⁴ Thus Plutarch speaks about 'boiling youth drunk with reputation and ambition (*νεότητα βακχεύουσαν ὑπὸ δόξης καὶ φιλοτιμίας*)'.¹⁶⁵ But ambition also has its constructive side. For the sake of fame (*cupido gloriae*), as Seneca writes, a young man will take all possible risks.¹⁶⁶ His assertiveness as well as his physical strength forms the basis of youthful courage, the *iuuenilis fortitudo*,¹⁶⁷ a quality which manifests itself in various fields but often degenerates into want of moderation (*intemperantia*),¹⁶⁸ audacity (*audacia*)¹⁶⁹ and boldness (*temeritas*).¹⁷⁰

As a result mainly of his impetuosity, the young man experiences all his feelings with the same intensity. As Horace says, he is

‘difficult with his educators (*monitoribus asper*)’,¹⁷¹ and there is often talk of the *irreverentia iuventutis*, a lack of respect for the older generation.¹⁷² He cannot be moderate in love or hate, he cannot control his rage, he is quick-tempered, quarrelsome, envious, cruel, vain, haughty.¹⁷³ This period of life is often put down as culprit of all the sins of Israel. According to Augustine, for instance, the devil is called an *adulescens* for his foolishness, his haughtiness, his boldness, his brutality ‘and for other vices which are usually abundant during this period of life (*ceteraque vitia quae huic aetati adsolent abundare*)’.¹⁷⁴

The characteristics mentioned so far are mainly related to youth’s strong emotions. Traits more related to ‘a lack of intelligence’ are rashness (*imprudencia*), frivolity (*levitas*), naivety and guilelessness (youth as the *improvida aetas*).¹⁷⁵ The young man lives here and now, does not think of the future, or, as Horace says, the useful (e.g. money).¹⁷⁶ His pattern of life is not yet clearly drawn out, he must—as is the opinion of a father in Terence—still learn how to live: *prius quaeso disce quid sit vivere*.¹⁷⁷

Horace found the young man to be as soft as wax, *cereus*.¹⁷⁸ At his age, he is, although to a lesser degree than a boy, easily pliable (youth as the *flexibilis aetas*),¹⁷⁹ and, although this certainly is not always easy, capable of improvement (youth as the *emendabilis aetas*).¹⁸⁰ As Cicero tells us, earnestness (*gravitas*) adorns adult life,¹⁸¹ while playfulness (physical as well as mental and emotional)—a characteristic not much appreciated in Rome—is a typical feature of an adolescent. His age (as well as that of a child) is the *lasciviens aetas*.¹⁸² We often hear of the game (*ludus*) and joke (*iocus*) of youth,¹⁸³ words that refer to a carefree, well-to-do life filled with, for example, sport, poetry, parties, squandering and, most of all, love.¹⁸⁴

The picture we have drawn of youth up to this point has been rather negative, a result of the fact that evaluations of youth in literature are more often than not negative, something which may not surprise us because most authors were older people, and middle and—especially—old age tend to be critical and pessimistic about youth,¹⁸⁵ especially about the contemporary, ‘modern’ younger generation.¹⁸⁶ Now and again, however, we do find positive statements about the youth, which concur with Aristotle’s relatively sympathetic view.

Thus youth was appreciated for its courage (as mentioned above), but also—although to a lesser extent than in Greece—for its charm

and elegance (*iuvenile decus, flos aetatis*),¹⁸⁷ and its cheerfulness and ‘good spirits’.¹⁸⁸ Sometimes reference is made to youthful idealism—perhaps by Horace, who calls a youth *sublimis*¹⁸⁹ (a word which can mean ‘haughty’ as well as ‘generous’)—and certainly by Augustine, who, although mostly negative about youth, speaks in his *Answer to the Sceptics* about this age as the period of life ‘which eagerly applies itself to the beautiful and honourable (*pulchra et honesta*)’.¹⁹⁰ We might also mention Tacitus, who, describing the cunning of young Drusus in some affair or other, notices that this characteristic is inconsistent with the spirit of openness and spontaneity which normally typifies youth: *incallidus alioqui et facilis iuuenta senilibus tum artibus uteretur*.¹⁹¹

Perhaps the most optimistic commentator on the young in Roman antiquity is Seneca. In one of his letters, he contrasts his lethargy as an old man with his youthful dynamism and idealism:

When the mind is young, it may most easily be won over to desire what is honourable and upright (*facillime enim tenera conciliantur ingenia ad honesti rectique amorem*); truth if she can obtain a suitable pleader, will lay strong hands upon those who are still able to be taught (*adhuc docilibus*), those who have been but superficially spoiled (*leviterque corruptis*).... [Look] how zealous neophytes are with regard to their first impulses towards the highest ideals, provided that someone does his part in exhorting them and in kindling their ardour.

Unique in Roman antiquity, Seneca goes on to say that youth is the best age of man:

Just as the purest wine flows from the top of the jar and the thickest dregs settle at the bottom, so in our human life, that which is best comes first.... Why which is best? Because what’s to come is uncertain. Because in our youth we are able to learn; we can bend to nobler purposes minds that are ready and still pliable (*facilem animum et adhuc tractabilem*); because this is the time for work, the time for keeping our minds busied in study and in exercising our bodies with useful effort; for that which remains is more sluggish and lacking in spirit—nearer the end.¹⁹²

Finally, we have to mention a frequently cited characteristic which the Romans believed typical of an exemplary youth, namely diffidence (*pudor, verecundia*), of which blushing (*iuvenalis rubor*) is the symptom.¹⁹³ An interesting testimony is given by Seneca, who relates how he made an unexpected visit to a young friend of Lucilius, and was enthusiastic about ‘this man of ability’ who was suddenly caught off his guard. The youth tried to collect himself, but ‘he could scarcely banish that hue of modesty, which is a good sign in a young man (*verecundiam, bonum in adulescente signum*)’.¹⁹⁴ Such a blush in adults can take one by surprise, ‘but it is more prevalent in youth because of the warmer blood and the sensitive countenance’.¹⁹⁵

This text clearly illustrates that the young Romans had their inhibitions too. The same can be said of a passage from Macrobius, where we are introduced to young Servius. When it was his turn to ask a question, ‘he was unsettled by his natural diffidence, changed colour and blushed’. His table-companion Disarius tried to encourage him: ‘Well, Servius, the most learned not only of your peers but also of all other men—pull yourself together, banish the diffidence to which your blush bears witness, speak freely with us about what comes to your mind’. Servius still could not utter a word, despite the repeated and urgent exhortations of his friend, but finally was able to ask a question: ‘I ask you the cause of what overcame me: why is blushing born of the diffidence of the soul?’¹⁹⁶

II

YOUTH AND THE ESTABLISHED ORDER

From the foregoing chapter it is clear that young people were not seen as real adults, that physiological maturity did not coincide with psychological or social maturity in the Roman world. This chapter will reveal that the young man certainly did not always wish to make a complete break with the adult world, but tried to prepare himself for his role within adult society, to integrate himself into it and to be taken seriously by the ‘official’ community and public opinion. Hence the importance attached to military service, politics and practising at the bar.

YOUTH AND THE ARMY¹

The *iuventus* as a class apart²

At the beginning of its history, archaic Roman society was divided into ‘classes’, each with its own task in the body politic, based on age.³ It was the duty of youth (*iuventus*, *pubes*) to spring to the defence of the state and to work to extend its influence. A world unto themselves, they had a group consciousness and set themselves over against the rest of society. To put it in the words of J.-P. Morel:

As an age group the *iuventus* enjoyed a measure of independence in the city, in which it formed in more than one respect a body not easily assimilated... The young, who spent a large part of their time under arms, formed, if not a secret, then at least a closed society that did not want to see the adults, the civilians, stamp on the prerogatives so dearly acquired by braving the perils of war and suffering quasiexclusion from political life.⁴

It was believed that Romulus already had divided his subjects into two classes, young and old (*iuniores maioresque*).⁵ It is also known that Servius Tullius distinguished between three agegroups: the *pueri* were those who were under 17, the *iuniores* those under 46, while the older ones were *seniores*.⁶ The young men were expected to defend the fatherland. Rome's future depended on them; the further survival of society was in their hands. This fact emerges clearly from Livy's description of the siege of Rome by the Gauls in 390 BC. When the situation became truly critical, the older citizens remained in the city and let themselves be massacred. The young people, on the other hand, entrenched themselves on the Capitol with all the food that remained. If they managed to survive, then the sacrifice made by their elders would have been worthwhile: *si militaris iuventus superfuert...facilem iacturam esse seniorum relictæ in urbe utique periturae turbae*.

The importance of youth in early days can be deduced from the role they played in the politics of that time, a topic which will be discussed later on.⁸ For the very reason that the *iuventus* manifested itself as a closed age-group, the word primarily signifies the *multitudo iuvenum*—not so much, and only in a later period, the age of youth—while *senectus* only refers to the age because older people rarely appeared in public as a group.⁹ The month of June (*Iunius*) would be named after them,¹⁰ and the *iuvenes* or *iuniores* placed themselves under the protection of the deity Iuventas, one of the earliest Roman goddesses, in G. Dumézil's view originally not so much patroness of individual youngsters as 'the mythical embodiment of an essential component of the state'.¹¹ It was those young men who were responsible for the rape of the Sabine women¹² and played the leading part in the Lupercalia, an exuberant fertility and purificatory rite held annually, from earliest times right up until late antiquity, on 15 February, during which youths, almost completely naked, ran about the Palatine striking women with strips of goat-skin.¹³ On certain occasions the *iuventus* also attracted attention to itself by its biting mockery, for instance, during triumphs and wedding ceremonies¹⁴ and in the so called *satura*, a kind of burlesque.¹⁵ Furthermore, it was especially soldiers who first came into contact with Greek culture, and contributed in no small measure to the dissemination of Greek customs and culture in Rome. It was to afford pleasure to ex-soldiers who had served in Sicily during the first Punic War, and there greatly enjoyed the performance of Greek comedies and tragedies,

that the first Latin plays, inspired by the Greek model, were produced in Rome in 240 BC.¹⁶

Soldiers and officers

*On the battlefield*¹⁷

Even during the late Republic, military fame was—in theory at least—held in higher regard than political achievement. The citizen who seeks fame, Cicero argues, has to see to it in the first instance that his deeds are honest; he continues: ‘The first thing to recommend to a young man in his quest for glory is that he tries to win it, if he can, in a military career. Among our forefathers many distinguished themselves as soldiers.¹⁸ Many youngsters, Polybius writes, were willing to court all sorts of danger so as to achieve the fame which pertained to great men.¹⁹ Bravery was regularly mentioned as one of the characteristic qualities of the young man.²⁰ Driven by virtual contempt for death, he dashed into the fray, while danger was more appealing than terrifying.²¹ A youth was intoxicated above all by the flush of his first victory.²² It comes as no surprise, therefore, to discover classical authors regularly referring to the fact that the young were more bellicose than the older generation, who were more aware of how disastrous the consequences of war could be.²³

Examples of heroism from the early years of Roman history are legion.²⁴ Even when they are not historical, they clearly illustrate the view on early Roman youth, the way one expected youth to behave in those days. There is the well-known example of Marcus Curtius, an outstanding warrior, who threw himself into an immense gulf in the middle of the forum so as to save Rome by his sacrifice.²⁵ Also well known is the story of Caius Mucius Scaevola, an *adulescens nobilis*, who was caught making an attempt on the life of the Etruscan king Porsenna. He coolly put his right hand in the fire and declared under oath that the whole cream of Roman youth (*principes iuventutis romanae*) were individually equally firm in their resolution to try and liquidate Porsenna. The king was so impressed that he released Scaevola and made peace with the Romans.²⁶

From more recent Roman history, Livy gives the example of young Scipio, later on the conqueror of Hannibal, who in 218 BC, at the tender age of 17 and in the first phase of puberty (*tum*

primum pubescens), came to the aid of his father and managed to rescue him from certain death.²⁷ After his victory over Perseus in 168 BC, Paullus Aemilius' immediate concern was the fate of his 17-year-old son, the Younger Scipio to be, who was nowhere to be found. Great was his relief, and that of the whole army, when he turned up, dripping with blood but otherwise all in one piece: like a bloodhound, as Plutarch tells us, he had allowed himself to be carried away by the intoxication of victory.²⁸ The heroism of the Elder Cato's son, too, was remarkable, particularly in view of his poor health. After having lost his sword in the heat of the battle, he thought life not worth living, begged his friends for help, fell upon the enemy and at last found his weapon hidden among great heaps of armour and fallen bodies.²⁹

During the late Republic, fame acquired through military prowess did not appeal to young men as strongly as it had in the past. Nonetheless we still meet youngsters who were prepared to sacrifice their lives in battle for something they believed in. As we know from Plutarch, there were quite a few young men studying in Athens in 44 BC who were willing to throw in their lot with Brutus in order to defend the Republic.³⁰ One of them was Marcus Cicero, the great orator's son. Even though he led a life of luxury, he distinguished himself fighting with Pompey when he was just 17 and later, after Caesar's murder, in Brutus' army.³¹ The Younger Cato's son, too, as the same Plutarch informs us, rejoiced in a certain infamy. He died, however, as a republican hero in the battle of Philippi. At a moment when everyone was in full retreat, he stood his ground, cried out his own name and that of his famous father, and was cut down after a fierce, heroic struggle, collapsing on to a pile of enemy corpses.³²

Many of those young men who distinguished themselves by their gallantry put their lives on the line for the sake of their native country and their own ideals. Yet youthful bravery also had its darker sides.³³ The thirst for battle was sometimes so ferocious that a young man readily forgot his superior's orders. When Titus Manlius Torquatus was challenged to a duel, he rose to the challenge, moved by anger but also by shame (*seu ira, seu detractandi certaminis pudor*) lest he be ridiculed as a coward. He emerged victorious in the duel. Yet he had gone against his father's command that, no matter how great the provocation, he should not enter into a duel. The father felt he should make an example of his son and allowed him to be executed. When the father returned to

Rome, as one can understand, the reactions of the older and the younger generations were not the same: 'It is said that on his approach only the seniors (*seniores*) went out to meet him, and that the young men (*iuventus*), then and for all the remainder of his days, abhorred and execrated him'.³⁴

There was a permanent danger that success would make a young man over-confident. Aemilius Paullus was aware of it. While he was hesitating about whether or not to attack King Perseus, the young officers rushed up to him and begged him not to postpone the fight any longer. Aemilius answered with the witticism that he would not postpone confrontation 'if he were their age'. After he had pulled off the victory, he summoned his sons, his sons-in-law and the young officers. After a pregnant pause he spoke. He reminded his youthful audience of the transitory nature of man's fate and sent them away 'with their vainglorious insolence and pride well curbed by his trenchant speech, as by a bridle'.³⁵

It happened all too easily, too, that youthful courage degenerated into recklessness and rashness. Many youngsters thereby met their doom. Such was the case with a young man called Hostus, who appears in Livy and who, with the impetuosity of youth (*adulescentia ferox*), entered the fray, with disastrous results.³⁶ Young Curio too, one of the most important representatives of the *jeunesse dorée* from the late Republic, took false rumours too seriously, with the hot-headedness of youth recklessly provoked a fight and, as Caesar informs us, heroically met his death.³⁷

Of course, not all youths were equally reckless—or even courageous. Even in early Roman history we meet young cowards and deserters.³⁸ Besides, even young soldiers who were not lacking in bravery often lacked experience and hardiness so that they commonly were inferior to, and disdained by, practised soldiers. 'Recruits have usually the advantage of age, but it is habit which teaches men to endure toil and despise wounds',³⁹ we read in Cicero; and before entering into the battle of Pharsalus, Caesar addresses his men with the following words: 'It is not difficult for hardy and veteran soldiers to overcome new recruits who are without experience in war, and who, moreover, like boys (*μειρακιωδῶς*) spurn the rules of discipline and of obedience to their commander'.⁴⁰

The conflict of generations

The following words of Ovid certainly apply to the army: 'Old age is readier to give counsel, youth to fight; the one age advises war, the other wages it (*haec dare consilium, pugnare paratior illa est; haec aetas bellum suadet, at illa gerit*)'.⁴¹ Many youths were far from happy with the fact that they were forced to stand aside for the older generation in what they considered their speciality. Conflicts between young and old were unavoidable.

This fact emerges clearly from a declamation by the Elder Seneca. A young man and his father were both candidates for the rank of general. 'Some said the general should be a young man, like Scipio, others an old man, like Fabius Maximus; a young man would fight energetically (*acriter*), an old man would do nothing rash (*nihil temere*). All the young men had got together as though what was in question were a comparison of ages (*adulescentulos omnis conspирasse, quasi de aetatis comparatione ageretur*)'.⁴²

Young men attracted attention by their seditious behaviour in the army in much the same way as they did in politics. As an army officer, the famous Clodius, later Cicero's arch-rival, was unhappy with the promotion he was receiving. He wanted to be top man but, on account of his dissipated life-style, there were many who passed him over. Plutarch reports that he had already in those days made a name for himself as a troublemaker, as someone who urged the soldiers, who were only too keen to hear his inflammatory words, to mutiny.⁴³ Young P. Crassus, too, Cicero tells us, was very ambitious: 'Because as a subordinate he had served a commander, he became ambitious to make forthwith a commander himself, a rank for which our usage has fixed a certain age, but uncertain assignment' His ambition was great—his dream was to be a new Alexander—but great was his fall also.⁴⁴

It is fairly obvious that the young were not always in full agreement with their superior's orders. When the dictator Papirius set out for Rome in 325 BC, he handed his authority over to Quintus Fabius, a *ferox adulescens* and head of the cavalry, and forbade him to undertake any aggressive action. Driven by ambition, however, and by the thirst for revenge, he launched a successful attack, 'aggrieved that all power should seem to be vested in the dictator' (*indignitate accensus quod omnia in dictatore viderentur reposita esse*).⁴⁵ One can compare young Rufus, who disobeyed Fabius Maximus' order not to attack and belittled his

opponent 'for being a coward, a hesitant one, somebody who sympathized with the enemy'.⁴⁶ The patience of L. Furius, a young military tribune, 'headstrong by his youth as well as by his native disposition' (*ferox cum aetate et ingenio*) was also worn out by Camillus' irresolute behaviour; he kept on repeating: 'Wars were the province of youth (*iuvenibus bella data*); the growth and decay of the spirit kept pace with those of the body (*cum corporibus vigere et deflorescere animos*)...the old man's strategy was cold and torpid (*frigere ac torpere senis consilia*).'⁴⁷

It is clear that youth challenged the supremacy of the older generation in the army. The most noteworthy example is that of the Elder Scipio.⁴⁸ In 211 BC, when Scipio was 25, the situation of Rome in its struggle with Hannibal seemed hopeless. Since there were no candidates for the position of supreme army commander, this young man put himself forward. Initially the reactions were highly favourable but, according to Livy, everyone thought it a pity he was still so young (*aetatis maxime paenitebat*). When Scipio became aware of this unrest, he spoke with such conviction about his tender youth and about the task to which he felt himself called, that this heavy responsibility was placed on the shoulders of 'someone of a totally immature age' (*aetati haudquaquam maturaе*). Not everyone, however, was happy with this arrangement. The elders considered Scipio's speech 'a young man's lighthearted talk (*κουφολογῆσαι νεανικῶς*) and mistrusted his bumptiousness (*προπέτεια*).'⁴⁹

A few years later (in 205 BC) the 31-year old Scipio, elected consul at this very early age, wanted to transfer the theatre of battle from Italy to Africa. Fighting on one's own soil was, in his eyes, 'a very antiquated and senile policy' which only befitted a dodderer like Fabius Maximus. The latter viewed his young opponent as a 'stupid youth' without any sense of responsibility (*ἀνὴρ ἀνοήτος καὶ νέος*) 'As an old man who was jealous and could not hope any more (*ὡς δύσκολος ἀνὴρ ἢ πάνπαν ὑπὸ γήρωσ ἀτολμος γεγονῶς καὶ δύσελπις*) he tried to withdraw the young men 'who were eager to serve under Scipio' from following the reckless young adventurer. He succeeded in convincing the senate (especially the older members) and in frightening the people.⁵⁰ The two opponents met in a head-on confrontation before the senate. Fabius took the floor first: it made no sense to accuse him of jealousy of someone who could have been his son; Scipio would do well to remember the disastrous fate of his uncle and father; so

many risky enterprises terminated in disaster. Scipio for his part refused to let himself be intimidated by his rival's condescending speech. He 'thanked' his rival for his 'sound' advice and 'paternal' interest. But why was Fabius suddenly so concerned about his youth? Was he now less qualified to take on such a task than some years before when he was commissioned to take care of the war with Carthage in Spain? Fabius was driven by jealousy! Where he himself was concerned, he would not rest easy until he had not only equalled his famous rival but even beaten him. The speeches of both opponents met with a mixed reaction, but, as Livy writes, 'especially the older senators were more praising the wisdom of the veteran than the confident spirit of the young man (*consilium senis quam animum adolescentis ferocem laudarent*)'.⁵¹

*Young officers*⁵²

From the foregoing it is evident that the Romans were not inclined to entrust serious military responsibility to (relatively) young men. But, of course, one could not refuse them all responsibility in this field. From a youth of rank it was expected and appreciated—though from the late Republic on not obligatory—that he should serve some time as a junior officer.

Especially from the time of Marius onwards, when the ranks of the army were increasingly filled with volunteers (first recruited on the Italian peninsula, later from ever more remote areas of the Empire), the military prowess of youths of the leisure class—who for a long time already had not served in the ranks—went into steady decline. Cicero offers explicit proof of this trend. In days gone by, he writes, valiant young warriors were thick on the ground, while in his own day they have become quite the exception, 'now that the profession of arms has fallen out of fashion among our youth'.⁵³ From the poems of Horace, too, it emerges clearly that many (perhaps most) youths of his day (the *inbellis iuventa*) were anything but enthusiastic about fighting and were not willing to risk their lives for the fatherland.⁵⁴

At this time a career as an army officer was still a useful asset for a well-to-do youth who wanted to enter the political arena. There were, however, easier ways of starting a public career. One's father's reputation helped, of course, as did pleading in the forum or belonging to the bodyguard of a famous politician (topics which will be discussed in later chapters) or the holding of a priesthood.⁵⁵

The social status of the officer class of the day plummeted visibly, as J. Suolahti has convincingly shown in his book on the junior officers of this period. The real elite did not need the army to make a successful career: 'Evidently this [the avoidance of military service, since it was no longer obligatory for a political career] was caused also by the weakening of the military spirit among the aristocratic youth, who now escaped rather lightly from their duties in the retinue of the commander,⁵⁶ if they entered a military career at all.' Even in Caesar's staff, military service was 'a pleasant adventure, especially for aristocratic youths'. 'Certainly Caesar could turn the best of the available noble youths into excellent officers, but presumably most young men were striving only for the rank of officer because of its advantages without thinking of the responsibilities connected with it.' Furthermore, Suolahti continues, certain officer posts tended to develop into nominal ones, and, understandably, 'these were much sought after [by young men] as they could be used for personal profit in a very great degree'.⁵⁷

Under the Empire this trend still increased, at least among the young who belonged to the senatorial class. This fact is clear from the words of Tacitus, who holds his father-in-law Agricola in high esteem on account of his exemplary behaviour as a young man when acting as military tribune, which is in sharp contrast to that of the *jeunesse dorée* of his own days 'who turn soldiering into self-indulgence' (*more iuvenum qui militiam in lasciviam vertunt*).⁵⁸ A lack of military spirit among the young also appears in Pliny, who, not without a certain nostalgia, compares the situation of his own day with former times:

Hence young men began their early training with military service, so that they might grow accustomed to command by obeying, and learn how to lead by following others.... For our own generation it was different. Though our early manhood was spent in camp, it was at a time when merit was under suspicion and apathy an asset, when officers lacked influence and soldiers respect, when there was neither authority nor obedience, and the whole system was slack, disorganized and chaotic, better forgotten than remembered.⁵⁹

The same feelings were articulated in later antiquity by Vegetius, who c. AD 400 complains that the best of the youth preferred a job

in the imperial administration to a career in the army: *civilis pars florentiorem abducebat iuventutem*.⁶⁰

*A common soldier*⁶¹

The high-ranking youth from the city of Rome and from Italy gradually disappeared from the ranks of the army.⁶² During the Empire officers of the Roman army—who tended increasingly to be *equites*—were professionals, generally men in their thirties, no (young) amateurs.⁶³ The ordinary soldiers were recruited from the lower classes of ever more remote parts of the Empire. They formed a world apart, with a very strong *esprit de corps*, and were professionals who were hardly ever described in terms of age. As such they need no discussion in this study. A glimpse of their way of life is provided by the following informative letter on papyrus written home in the second century AD by one Apion, who came from a little Egyptian village, after he was enrolled as a recruit in the Roman navy:

Apion to Epimachus, his father and lord, very many greetings.

Before all else I pray for your health and that you may always be well and prosperous, together with my sister and her daughter and my brother. I thank the lord [godhead] Serapis that when I was in danger at sea he straightway saved me. On arriving at Misenum I received from Caesar three gold pieces for travelling expenses. And it is well with me. Now I ask you, my lord, and father, write me a letter, telling me first of your welfare, secondly of my brother's and sister's, and enabling me thirdly to make obeisance before your handwriting, because you educated me well and I hope thereby to have quick advancement, if the gods so will. Give many salutations to Capiton, and my brother and my sister and Serenilla and my friends. I have sent you by Euctemon [a specialist in pictures of soldiers?] a portrait of myself. My name [as a Roman soldier] is Antonius Maximus, my company the Athenonica. I pray for your health.⁶⁴

YOUTH AND POLITICS⁶⁵

Politics, at least during the Republic, was a major preoccupation for Rome's youth of rank. Many dreamt of one day—preferably as soon as possible—occupying a leading position in the state. Someone like Sallust is typical:

When I myself was a young man (*adulescentulus*), my inclinations at first led me, like many another, into public life, and there I encountered many obstacles; for instead of modesty, incorruptibility and honesty, shamelessness, bribery and rapacity held sway. And although my soul, a stranger to evil ways, recoiled from such faults, yet amid so many vices my youthful weakness (*imbecilla aetas*) was led astray and held captive by ambition; for while I took no part in the evil practices of the others, yet the desire for preferment made me the victim of the same ill-repute and jealousy as they.⁶⁶

Bands of youth⁶⁷

*The early Republic*⁶⁸

The early history of Rome is shrouded in myths and legends. Nonetheless the historians of antiquity probably correctly attributed a significant role to the youth of the period and clearly identified them as a homogeneous social group. There can be no doubt that what here follows cannot be established with one hundred percent certainty, yet this is not so important for a study such as the present one. What does matter is that there is a historical core, that in that dim and distant past genuine tensions arose between young and old, tensions which later historians interpreted through the light in which they saw contemporary youth; as a result, this sub-section about the early Republic's youth can also teach us a lot about youth in the later Republic.

The Republic was inaugurated in Rome after the fall of the king Tarquinius Superbus (510 BC). Not everyone was equally happy with this turn of events:

There were among the young men a number of youths, the sons of families not unimportant, whose pleasures had been less confined under the monarchy who, being of the same age

as the young Tarquinius and their cronies, had grown used to the untrammelled life of princes. This licence they missed, now that all enjoyed equal rights, and they had got into the way of complaining to each other that the liberty of the rest had resulted in their own enslavement.⁶⁹

Among the malcontents were the sons of Brutus, Rome's first consul, youths who, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus emphatically states had only just reached the age of puberty (*ἀρτίως ἀρχόμενοι γενειᾶν*) They had made contact with the ousted king and wanted to restore him to power. A letter was intercepted and the conspiracy exposed. All these noble youths (*nobiles adulescentes*) were put to death and Brutus, without batting an eyelid, attended the execution of his own sons.⁷⁰

Youth also played an important role in the violent struggle between the patricians and the plebeians. They defended the privileges of the patricians with remarkable obstinacy. According to tradition, in 494 BC the *plebs* rebelled for the first time against the arbitrariness of the patricians and refused the draft. When the consuls hesitated about taking stiff measures, they were berated by the younger senators for being cowards. They should renounce office if they were incapable of taking decisions.⁷¹ Appius Claudius, a fanatical champion of the patricians, demanded in the heated discussions that followed that a dictator be appointed to teach the *plebs* some manners. His proposal was greeted with deafening applause by the younger senators. The older members were against it but had to renounce their opposition in favour of the young men, who resorted to violence.⁷² They did manage to have the 'moderate' Valerius appointed. When the latter could achieve absolutely nothing for the people, he resigned from office. The people retreated to the Sacred Hill. Once again disunity broke out in the senatorial ranks. The young men were the radicals who would not hear of concessions; the older men, on the contrary, longed for peace. They remembered the disastrous consequences of earlier civil wars, and were dismayed at the cries and rowdy behaviour of the young men, their rivalry, and the unbridled ferocity, the almost physical violence, with which they attacked the consuls. As a last resort, they turned to prayers and tears to win the young over to another viewpoint.⁷³ The consuls begged for unanimity among old and young. If this cannot be achieved, they argued, then it is the young who have to give in. They must remember that they will

receive the same deference from youth when they themselves have reached old age. If they do not restrain their unbridled ambition, then measures will be taken, they will no longer be able to sit as judges and a minimum age will be established for entry into the senate.⁷⁴

The *plebs* were granted certain concessions, including the codification of the law by the *decemviri* in 451 BC. A second decemvirate, led by the aforementioned Appius Claudius, conducted a reign of terror and distinguished itself by contempt for the people. The elders distanced themselves from them, but the *decemviri* received the wholehearted support of the younger generation. Each of them surrounded himself with a band of audacious young fellows (τοὺς θρασυτάτους τῶν νέων) who robbed their opponents of their possessions, laid hands on their women and thrashed them as if they were slaves if they dared to put up opposition. Many prominent citizens actually left the city. According to Dionysius, the supporters of the *decemviri* were pleased to see this happen, 'particularly because it greatly increased the arrogance of the licentious youth not to have before their eyes those persons whose presence would have made them blush whenever they committed any wanton act'.⁷⁵

Let us go back a few years in history. In 461 BC the patricians opposed the *rogatio Terentilia* with might and main.⁷⁶ It was an enactment which, by the codification of the law, sought to impose restraints on the patricians' power. Feelings again began to run high. Young and old in the patrician ranks wanted nothing to do with the law, but 'the older nobles for the most part took no share in an affair which was not to be guided by wisdom, but had been committed to rashness and impudence'. To a considerable extent the consuls too kept aloof, 'lest they should expose their dignity to some affront in the general confusion'. The leader of the youth at the time was Caeso Quinctius, a hot-headed youth (*ferox iuvenis*), 'emboldened not only by his noble birth but also by his great stature and physical strength', a brilliant warrior and orator to boot. With him leading the band, the tribunes of the *plebs* were regularly chased from the forum and forced to take flight, and anyone foolhardy enough to resist would end up slinking off 'manhandled and stripped'. The tribunes directed their hatred against him: 'It was Caeso alone, as being a suspected character, who got all the blame for many a rash word and act which proceeded from the young aristocrats.' Caeso was summoned before the court, yet he

haughtily refused to defend himself. His defender drew attention to his merits as a soldier and excused his hot-headedness on the grounds of his youth. 'He earnestly advised the people to prefer that a distinguished youth, endowed with every advantage of nature and of fortune, and sure to be an important factor in the affairs of any state which he might join, should rather be their own than the citizen of another nation. Those qualities in him which gave offence, impetuosity and rashness, were diminishing each day, as he grew older; that in which he was deficient, namely prudence, was daily increasing.' The prosecution, on the other hand, demanded stiff punishment for this arrogant, unbridled young man and did not shrink from trumping up false charges, such as that he killed a plebeian in the course of a nocturnal raid.⁷⁷

Without even waiting for the verdict, Caeso fled into exile. The opposition offered by the youth was thereby not broken. The contrary was the case:

So far as the older senators were concerned, they had indeed relinquished their grasp upon the government; but the juniors, especially those who had been of Caeso's fellowship, grew more bitter against the *plebs*, and their courage ran as high as ever. Yet they greatly promoted their cause by tempering their fury with a kind of moderation. At the first attempt after Caeso's exile to pass the law, they were organized and ready, and fell upon the tribunes with a great army of clients, as soon as the tribunes gave them an excuse by attempting to remove them; in such way that no single patrician came off with any conspicuous share of glory or unpopularity, and the plebeians complained that a thousand Caesos had sprung up in the place of one. During the intervening days on which the tribunes took no action about the law, nothing could have been more peaceable or quiet than those same youths. They would salute plebeians courteously, converse with them, invite them to their houses, assist them in the courts and permit the tribunes to hold their other assemblies without an interruption. They never displayed arrogance towards any one, either openly or in private, except when the law came up; at other times they were democratic. By avoiding so much as an offensive word, to say nothing of any sort of violence, they managed little by little, with

gentleness and tact, to disarm the hostility of the plebs. By such arts the law was evaded for an entire year.⁷⁸

This telling illustration shows that the youth knew the tactics of the political game, and that action taken by them could be successful. The patrician youth (*patricii iuvenes*) are again mentioned in 439 BC, when they formed Servilius Ahala's bodyguard, and in 367 BC, when they took part in the organization of the great public games (*ludi maximi*).⁷⁹ Thereafter nothing more is heard of them for a rather long period, and it is not at all clear why they disappeared from the political stage. It will be a long time before one can get a further insight—this time on the basis of more trustworthy sources—into the political activities and ambitions of the younger generation.

*The late Republic*⁸⁰

Compared with the 'ultra-right' youth of the early Republic, young people — 'semi-organized groups of upper-class "teenagers"', as R.M.Ogilvie says⁸¹—in the late Republic often (though not always) adopted an extreme 'left-wing' position. They were, in any case, to borrow a word of O.Seel, typical *Revolutionsjugend*.⁸² Even though some young people were disgusted with the contemporary political scene,⁸³ the average young man of rank was more absorbed in politics than at perhaps any other period in history. Very few managed to occupy political office under the minimum age—then 30 years of age— but as a group they influenced political life in a considerable way and no politician could allow himself to overlook them.

In their day Sulla and Marius were already looking to the younger generation to support their politics.⁸⁴ A great deal more is known of the role played by youth in Catiline's conspiracy (63 BC).⁸⁵ Sallust leaves no doubt about it:

In a city so great and so corrupt Catiline found it very easy to surround himself, as by a bodyguard, with troops of criminals and reprobates of every kind... Most of all Catiline sought the intimacy of the young (*maxime adulescentium familiaritates adpetebat*); their minds, still pliable as they were and easily moulded, were without difficulty ensnared by his wiles. For carefully noting the passion which burned in each, according

to his time of life, he found harlots for some or bought dogs and horses for others; in fine, he spared neither expense nor his own decency, provided he could make them submissive and loyal to himself.... The greater part of the young men also, in particular those of high position (*iuventus pleraque, sed maxume nobilium*), were favourable of Catiline's project; for although in quiet times they had the means of living elegantly or luxuriously, they preferred uncertainty to certainty, war to peace (*incerta pro certis, bellum quam pacem malebant*).⁸⁶

It is obvious that Catiline was especially successful with young men of the upper classes. But, as is also evident from Sallust, his attraction was not limited to youths or even to people from the city: 'Besides this, the young men (*iuventus*) who had maintained a wretched existence by manual labour in the country, tempted by public and private doles had come to prefer idleness in the city to their hateful toil.'⁸⁷

Catiline himself saw his struggle as a conflict of generations: 'We are in the prime of life, we are stout of heart; to them, on the contrary, years and riches have brought utter dotage.'⁸⁸ Much to Cicero's disgust, this man was an absolute master at manipulating the youth of his day.⁸⁹ Youths were later to play a significant role in his conspiracy and, as Sallust reports again, he gave them all the training they needed:

To the young man he had ensnared, as I have described, he taught many forms of wickedness. From their number he supplied false witnesses and forgers; he bade them make light of honour, fortune, and dangers; then, when he has sapped their good repute and modesty, he called for still greater crimes. If there was no immediate motive for wrong-doing, he nevertheless waylaid and murdered innocent as well as guilty; indeed he preferred to be needlessly vicious and cruel rather than to allow their hands and spirits to grow weak through lack of practice.⁹⁰

The picture we are given by Sallust—as well as by Cicero and Plutarch⁹¹—of the youthful supporters of Catiline is not very comforting. However, it is probably a distorted picture. Doubtless, some young people did hope to land themselves well-paid little sinecures, but probably other well-heeled youths genuinely believed

in Catiline's revolutionary ideas, in his (so-called?) struggle for increased freedom and social reforms, in his opposition to the arbitrary will of the oligarchy. When Cicero, some years later, was defending his young friend Caelius, he admitted 'that many estimable young men were devoted to that wicked and vicious man', and that this was very understandable as Catiline had such a strong and fascinating personality:

Yes, Caelius did support Catiline after he had several years' training in public life; and many, of all ranks and ages, have done the same. For this Catiline, as I think you remember, showed in himself numerous features of excellence, if not firmly modelled, at least drawn in outline. He associated with many depraved persons. Yes, but he pretended that he was devoted to men of excellent character. Men found in him many allurements to debauchery; also certain qualities that were incentives to unflagging toil. The fires of profligacy blazed within him; yet he had a keen interest in the art of war. No, I do not believe that there has ever existed on earth so strange a portent, such a fusion of natural tastes and desires that were contradictory, divergent, and at war amongst themselves.⁹²

In this passage it is clearly Cicero the lawyer appearing, but the nuanced picture of Catiline he tries to impress upon his audience here is clearly closer to reality than the portrait presented by him in his Catiline orations.

By the drastic steps he took against Catiline, Cicero certainly alienated a great part of the *jeunesse dorée*.⁹³ The situation did not improve when, in 62 BC, he openly opposed Clodius. This 'ferocious young man' (*adulescens furens*),⁹⁴ who perpetrated one outrage after another, was a candidate for the office of quaestor when, disguised as a woman, he tried to force his way into the solemn rite in honour of the goddess Bona Dea—a ceremony to which only women were admitted—so as to get close to Caesar's wife, Pompeia, who was his mistress. He was caught in the act and accused of sacrilege. Although Clodius had probably supported Cicero in his confrontation with Catiline, the exconsul destroyed his alibi by testifying that Clodius was actually in Rome on the given day. Concerning the reasons, he himself wrote: 'There, I thought, I had a chance of using the surgeon's knife on licentiousness and curbing youthful excesses (*locum resecandae libidinis et coercendae*

iuventutis); and I exerted myself, putting forth all the resources of my intellect and mind, not out of private spite, but in the hope of effecting a radical cure of the State.⁹⁵ From that day on Clodius nurtured an implacable hatred for Cicero, and his inflammatory actions steadily increased. The youth, and above all Catiline's 'veterans', originally supported him. A case in point was Curio's son or, as Cicero scornfully remarked on account of his effeminate appearance and behaviour, 'daughter'. At the head of 'the youths with budding beards' (*barbatuli iuvenes*),⁹⁶ and in cooperation with Clodius' 'troops', he tried, by means of various inflammatory activities, to prevent the populace from endorsing a senatorial enactment concerning the sacrilege committed by Clodius.⁹⁷

Cicero underestimated the forces he had unleashed against himself and tried to win back the youth to his side. From a letter written in 60 BC, it would seem that he had managed to win over these 'bottle-conspirators' (*comissatores coniurationis*), as he calls them elsewhere.⁹⁸ 'The dislike which had been aroused against me among our dissipated and dandified youths (*libidinosae at delicatae iuventutis*) has been smoothed away by my affability, and now they pay me more attention than anyone.'⁹⁹ Cicero compromised a little in order to get the youth on his side. Curio, whom he had recently so contemptuously ill-used, was now 'his' Curio. The great orator had suddenly the highest expectations of him. One fine day Curio came along to unburden himself of his feelings concerning the conduct of Clodius and the *triumviri*. There can be no doubt but that this ambitious youth was aware of the threat the *triumviri* represented for the republican regime, of the fact that their immoderate puissance would check the political progress of any freelance. He was not alone in not wishing to have nothing to do with the new tyrants: 'It is astonishing how he "holds proud kings in hate"', and he tells me that the younger generation in general holds equally strong views, and cannot put up with the present state of affairs'; 'Megabocchus and the rest of that bloodthirsty band of youths (*sanguinaria iuventus*) are at daggers drawn with them.'¹⁰⁰ The future *triumvir* Mark Antony also withdrew his loyalty from Clodius. After he first gained notice by his shameless relation with Curio,¹⁰¹ he joined Clodius' band for a short time and participated in their wanton activity. He quickly became fed up with Clodius' 'frenzy': partly for fear of the 'respectable' citizens who were banding together to oppose this brazen demagogue, he left Italy in 58 BC at the age of 24 to study in Greece.¹⁰²

During Clodius' tribunate in 58 BC, and for several years thereafter, Rome looked like an occupied city.¹⁰³ Clodius' gangs indulged in an orgy of violent behaviour, setting homes on fire, plundering, murdering and making the normal democratic process unworkable. The actual involvement of the city's youth seems to have been rather limited, otherwise Cicero would have played upon it. By this time Clodius had apparently lost the support of the youth and, like his opponent Milo, used hired professionals (members of the proletariat and slaves, including many gladiators) for his violent activities.

Cicero had won the youth to his side. One ought rather to say 'won back', for, even prior to the Clodius affair, he had been able to rely on the support of a considerable section of the younger generation. He was popular with them as an orator. There can be no doubt but that many idolized him.¹⁰⁴ His brother Quintus was of the opinion that these young people (*adulescentuli*) enhanced his stature and gave him extensive support in his campaign for the office of consul by recruiting votes, spreading electoral propaganda, etc.¹⁰⁵

During the consulate itself Cicero, just like Catiline, surrounded himself with young admirers, who, we learn from Plutarch, accompanied him from his home to the Campus Martius when the contest with Catiline was coming to its climax.¹⁰⁶ Armed *adulescentes nobiles* occupied the Capitol at the time of the debate on the penalty of the conspirators.¹⁰⁷ They too showed no reluctance in using violence. Caesar—suspected of complicity in the Catiline conspiracy—opposed the execution of some conspirators. As he was leaving the senate, Cicero's bodyguard jumped on him and threatened him with drawn swords. Their eyes were on Cicero, but he—however willing he might be, according to Plutarch—shook his head because he feared the mob and the consequences of a totally illegal act.¹⁰⁸

Also at the climax of his conflict with Clodius and when his expulsion was threatened, he could count on the support of numerous young people—as many as 20,000 (!), Plutarch writes—who wore mourning in the streets of Rome.¹⁰⁹ After his return from exile his popularity with the young was still great. Now that he was shunted out of the political arena, he devoted himself to the study of philosophy, and in this way—again our source is Plutarch—he managed to win the most influential young people to his side.¹¹⁰ When, towards the end of his life, Cicero believed he could yet again

play a significant role in politics, he engaged in a life-and-death struggle with Mark Antony. Once again he received wide support from the young, as appears from the words of Flavius Galenus, an ally of Antony, who accused the great orator of ‘always inciting the young men against their elders and leading those who trust him, even in the slightest degree, into dangers, and then deserting them’.¹¹¹

In his struggle with the first triumvirate—and with Caesar in particular—Cicero was initially able to rely on the support of the younger generation. Curio above all was a formidable opponent of Caesar. In Cicero’s opinion, this *adulescens* was the only person in Rome who in 59 BC, at the age of about 25, dared say openly what he believed; and he was loudly applauded for his candour and courage.¹¹² According to Cicero, Caesar tried to have Curio eliminated by calling on the services of a certain Vettius, a professional informer. The latter claimed that Curio, at the head of a band of youngsters (*manum iuventutis duce Curione*)—including Brutus, the later murderer of Caesar, then only 20—had planned a conspiracy with a view to liquidating Pompey. This charge was so transparently false that Vettius himself was clamped in gaol.¹¹³

When Caesar noticed that the younger generation did not spontaneously and enthusiastically support his revolutionary plans, he tried—as Suetonius reports—to bribe them with money and held out for them the hopes of beneficial results from civil war: *bello civili opus esse*.¹¹⁴ From a letter written by Cicero in 50 BC it emerges that Caesar could rely on those whom Cicero termed ‘young loafers’ (*perdita iuventus*), or virtually all the youth of the day (*omnem fere iuventutem*).¹¹⁵ The leaders of the younger generation, such as Caelius, Curio, Dolabella, all of whom had maintained strong ties with Cicero, now transferred their support to the other camp and sold their loyalty to the highest bidder. The cynicism of certain young people of the day can be deduced from a letter written by Caelius to Cicero: ‘You do not, I suppose, overlook the fact that men involved in a feud in their own country, so long as the struggle is carried on constitutionally and without recourse to arms, are bound to follow the more honourable, but when it comes to war and taking the field, the stronger cause, and to resolve upon that as the better course in proportion to its greater safety.’¹¹⁶

Caesar’s antagonist in this grim struggle for power was Pompey. According to Plutarch, already during his campaigns in the East he tried to hold on to any young people he casually encountered.¹¹⁷ In

61 BC, Cicero and Gnaeus Pompey were on good terms, and the youth who took up Cicero's cause also supported Pompey: 'These bottle-conspirators, these youths with budding beards (*isti comissatores coniurationis, barbatuli iuvenes*) in common table-talk call him Gnaeus Cicero.'¹¹⁸ In 59 BC, however, the youth turned against him on account of his alliance with Caesar and Crassus. Curio—and a wide section of the youth along with him—was, according to Cicero, hostile not only to Caesar but also to Pompey.¹¹⁹ In the same year C. Porcius Cato— 'a dim-witted young man, but nonetheless a Roman citizen and a Cato'—openly accused Pompey of being a *privatus dictator*.¹²⁰ Under pressure from all sides, Pompey, according to Plutarch, felt compelled to seek support from young adventurers.¹²¹ In 56 BC his prospects seemed far from rosy and, as Cicero writes, the depraved youth (*perdita iuventus*) were out for his blood.¹²² When the civil war broke out, a large section of the youth, as has already been seen, chose to side with Caesar. Others saw Pompey as the defender of republican ideals and therefore took up his cause. One of these was Marcus Cicero, son of the great orator, who already at the age of 17 distinguished himself as commander of a cavalry wing in the battle of Pharsalus.¹²³

After the defeat of Pompey in 48 BC Caesar granted a pardon to his young opponents and thus tried to win them over to his side. Over the next few years opposition to his dictatorship grew. When he was killed in 44 BC—Cicero stresses the role of the *adulescentes* in this assassination¹²⁴—many hailed the murderers as the saviours of the Republic. Brutus fled to Athens. According to Plutarch, he found there a large number of students who were prepared to fight and risk their lives for republican ideals. Among them were Horace, Cato's son, and Marcus Cicero, so dear to Brutus 'on account of his hatred of the tyrants'.¹²⁵ As O. Seel has written:

What Brutus brought with him and what he had to offer was not much, but it was everything that a partly ebullient, partly blasé youth could want, for whom the good counsel and example of their fathers had become questionable in view of their miserable actual achievements: lofty words about liberty regained, the mythical glow of the new tyrannicide who bore the name of the old; the call to battle, where a man still had his worth. Students flocked to him, good and bad, idealists and desperadoes, to win their life or to lose it.¹²⁶

From what has been described so far of the political activities of youth during the late Republic, it transpires clearly that the young members of the elite played a significant political role and that no politician could afford to ignore them. It is true that the behaviour of many was far from exemplary and that the description Sallust gives of Cn. Piso—‘a young noble (*adulescens nobilis*), a man of the utmost recklessness, poor, and given to intrigue, who was being goaded on by need of funds and an evil character to overthrow the government’¹²⁷—applies to quite a number of the young. In another passage we read an unflattering description of the youth of his day in which Ps.-Sallust established the link between their prodigal behaviour and their revolutionary, even anarchic tendencies:

Mere youths think it a fine thing to waste their own substance and that of others, to refuse nothing to their own lust and the demands of their fellows, to regard such conduct as evidence of manliness and high spirit, but to consider modesty and self-restraint as cowardice. Therefore the headstrong spirit... subverts the established order of things, and is eager for a revolution.¹²⁸

Furthermore, one has to take into account the thirst for adventure, for change and renewal which characterizes youth, so that it is entirely to be expected that they, ‘preferred uncertainty to certainty, war to peace’.¹²⁹ Many gave themselves to the revolutionary cause for financial reward, but for many others causing havoc with public order was, as the same historian writes, more than enough reward: *tametsi illis quieta movere magna merces videbatur*.¹³⁰

The motivation just outlined certainly helps to account for the behaviour of the youth of the day. It deserves to be pointed out, however, that it was not easy for young people living in this chaotic period to choose the most high-minded party and that their elders hardly set them an edifying example. Certainly there were youths who were fired with idealism, who genuinely had faith in the person and ideology of a Cicero, a Caesar, a Catiline, and who risked their lives for republican ideals when they were threatened. The words which R.G. Austin wrote concerning Caelius apply equally to other young Romans during this period:

In him is to be seen a clear picture of a brilliant young Roman whose exceptional talents were forced by the very decadence of the period to do him disservice; possibly, according to modern standards of morality, he is an unscrupulous, unattractive, and even dangerous figure, yet very certainly he is a tragic one.... He should rather be judged by the spirit of his generation; and with all his faults, and they were many, he is a man whose very exuberant vitality lends him charm and fascination for all who realize that the Romans were human like ourselves.¹³¹

The influence exercised by youth on political life in the last decades of the Republic can hardly be overestimated. But who were these youths? In the first instance it was youngsters of the higher classes, sons of senators and equestrian youths; but less wealthy city youths also and—as is stated explicitly by Sallust—even country youths¹³² sometimes took part in the political clashes of the day. They too dreamt of enrichment and social promotion; they too could dream of another—a better?—community. The *equites* played an important role in politics—especially when we use the word in a broad, non-technical sense—but in my eyes the *iuventus* and the *ordo equester* are not necessarily—or not always—synonyms. The young *nobiles* were a class within the *equites*, I believe, but young men who did not belong to this class also participated in the political troubles of those days. It was not necessary to be an *eques* to be a supporter of, for example, Catiline or Cicero: they could use every young man. I believe P. McGushin is right when he writes:

In Sallust [and probably not only Sallust] the *iuventus* includes the young men, without regard to their origin, who have become the victims of [or felt attracted to] sloth and prodigality. This concept is not confined to the *nobiles*. ... [It] applies to the state as a whole, and to its younger citizens as such, not as members of a party or a class,¹³³

The conflict of generations¹³⁴

From the foregoing it is obvious that young and old could clash during the early as well as the late Republic. Gangs of young radicals influenced political life in no small degree. They often acted in accordance with, or even on instigation of, older people, but not

rarely disagreed with them. In what follows we study the conflict between individual youths and the older generation.

Some youngsters like Caeso, Caelius or Curio were important representatives of the younger generation whom politicians could ill afford to disregard. They did not manage, however, to occupy important political (and military) offices as the Elder Scipio did, to the great annoyance of the older generation, as has been seen.¹³⁵ With Scipio the *iuventus* triumphed—not so surprising in war-time—but as soon as war with Hannibal was over the older generation tried to curb youth. As H.H.Scullard writes, ‘the fixing of minimum age-limits for offices [by the *Lex Villia annalis*] would check the speedy advance of ambitious young nobles and preclude the repetition of such scandal as when *superior Africanus et T.Flamininus admodum adulescentes consules facti*’.¹³⁶

Most youths had no option but to content themselves with the subordinate role assigned to them by their elders. However, there were some youngsters, such as Pompey and Octavian, who at a very young age managed to win considerable military (and political) power and fame. They both had to overcome the resistance of the older generation, so their struggle for power can be seen at least partly as a conflict of generations.

As with Scipio, the star of young Pompey¹³⁷ rose with lightning speed. This ‘young executioner’ (*adulescentulus carnifex*), as Valerius Maximus calls him,¹³⁸ had few scruples in advancing his career. With a view to putting pressure on the mighty Sulla at the age of only 23 (83 BC) he press-ganged a sizeable number of soldiers and appointed himself their chief. When, after some military successes, he was greeted as ‘Imperator’ by Sulla, everyone, we hear from Plutarch, was taken aback, given that he was so young and had not even a seat in the Senate. A little later (in 81 BC) Sulla called him ‘Magnus’, but Pompey was not satisfied and expressed the desire to be received in triumph. Sulla made clear his opposition to such a plan: it was not fitting that a ‘beardless youngster’ (*οὔπω πάνυ γενειῶν*) should receive such an honour; it would bring his administration into disrepute and damage his reputation and he was prepared to resort to arms against this youth if need be. Pompey’s reaction, however, was so threatening that an anxious Sulla gave his reluctant approval. So this young man triumphed at the age of 26, an unprecedented success for one so young. As Plutarch informs us, he could easily have got elected to the Senate under the minimum age of 30, but he was not interested in it

‘because his triumph was all the more celebrated given that he was not yet elected to the senate’.¹³⁹

The most remarkable case of a youth who, despite the opposition and even the enmity of the majority of the elders, was able to force his way into politics and public life, was that of Octavian,¹⁴⁰ later to become Caesar Augustus, founder of the principate. His rise to fame was anything but an example of moral and political integrity. In the turbulent days following the murder of Julius Caesar in 44 BC, this mere 18-year-old youth did not hesitate to hasten to Rome from Apollonia, a town on the coast of Albania where he was studying, to claim his rights as the adoptive son and chief heir of the dictator. If he was to seize power, it was essential for him to overcome the prejudice against his tender years. He had powerful supporters in Rome who praised his *virtus* and pointed to examples of other young men who had taken on great responsibilities long before they had reached the required age. One of them was Cicero, even though in his own mind the great orator had his reservations about Octavian’s age (and intentions).¹⁴¹ The future emperor also faced considerable opposition. His opponents disdained him, called him a ‘snot’ (puer, adulescentulus, *μειράκιον, παῖς*) and spoke of him as a pushy, inexperienced ‘pup’.¹⁴² His principal enemy was Antony. According to, for example, Appian, this man viewed Octavian as a haughty youngster, as someone who had no respect for his elders or those in authority, and who needed a royal kick in the pants.¹⁴³ Nor was the senate particularly favourably disposed to him: they only wanted to ‘use’ him to curb Antony’s power, and when Octavian asked for a triumph, it was refused, ‘while he was asking honours which surpassed his age’.¹⁴⁴ He was also denied a consulate and the senate tried to fob him off by conferring meaningless honours. Octavian was furious, particularly as he was still always considered a child (*μειράκιον καὶ παῖδα*) and he resorted to arms.¹⁴⁵ Not yet 20, he managed to force his way into office as consul. He was singularly proud of his achievement because, according to Dio Cassius, he had achieved this office at an earlier age than anyone ever had before him.¹⁴⁶

As R.Syme writes, ‘All conventions are baffled and defied by Caesar’s heir. Not for nothing that the ruler of Rome made use of a signet-ring with a sphinx engraved. The revolutionary [young] adventurer eludes grasp and definition no less than the mature statesman’.¹⁴⁷ It was indeed a ‘miracle’ that this ‘student’, who four or five years earlier had had to ask his mother’s permission before

leaving his home,¹⁴⁸ now ruled the Roman Empire. He must have been an exceptionally talented youth, but that he managed to reach his goal on his own is, as A.Alföldi convincingly argues, almost beyond belief. There were various powers at work behind the scenes: the name of Caesar, his veterans, money, and people in the wings such as Balbus and Oppius. ‘They prepared the launch pad from which Octavian effortlessly reached the highest political orbit’.¹⁴⁹

Young emperors¹⁵⁰

The principle of succession established by Augustus when he set up the principate meant that a number of emperors were very young when they came to the throne. Examples are legion: Nero (emperor at the age of 17), Commodus (at 19), Elagabalus (at 14), Caracalla (at 23), Alexander Severus (at 13), Constans, Gratian, Valentinian II, Arcadius, Honorius, Romulus Augustulus, the last emperor of Rome. Readers familiar with W.Hartke’s book on the Roman child (and teenage) emperors will have noted that the Romans as a rule were anything but enthusiastic about such ‘emperorlets’: ‘For indeed, nothing was more alien to Roman tradition with its strict division into age-grades than having a child in the highest position of the Empire.’¹⁵¹ We often read how people feared youthful rashness, audacity, ambition.¹⁵² There was a general belief that honours conferred at too early an age spoiled a youth,¹⁵³ and that the young were more inclined to cruelty than older people.¹⁵⁴ Aversion to young emperors is a theme which runs through the whole of Herodian’s work and is particularly striking in the following passage: ‘The more mature emperors took greater care to control themselves and their subjects because of their political experience. The very young ones (*οἱ κομιδῇ νέοι*) led rather less disciplined lives and brought in many innovations. This disparity in age and authority naturally resulted in different activities’.¹⁵⁵ The same topos is a *Leitmotiv* in the *Augustan History*, where the appointment of the old Tacitus (not the historian, of course!) as emperor is cheered vociferously:

We have chosen as prince a man advanced in years, one who will watch over all like a father. From him we need fear nothing ill-considered, nothing over hasty, nothing cruel. All his actions, we may predict, will be earnest, all dignified, and,

in fact, what the commonwealth herself would command.... Indeed, if you should wish to consider those monsters of old, a Nero, I mean, an Elagabalus, a Commodus—or rather, always, an *Incommodious*—you would assuredly find that their vices were due as much to their youth (*vitia aetatum*) as to the men themselves. May the gods forbend that we should give the title of prince to a child or of Father of his Country to an immature boy, whose hand a schoolmaster must guide for the signing of his name and who is induced to confer a consulship by sweetmeats or toys or other such childish delights. What wisdom is there—a plague upon it!—in having as emperor one who has not learned to care for fame, who knows not what the commonwealth is, who stands in dread of a guardian, who looks to a nurse, who is in subjection to the blows or the fear of a schoolmaster's rod, who appoints as consuls or generals or judges men whose lives, whose merits, whose years, whose families, whose achievements he knows not at all?... Let us rejoice that we have an elder as our prince!¹⁵⁶

Young officials¹⁵⁷

As has been said already,¹⁵⁸ the *Lex Villia annalis* (180 BC), 158 directly or indirectly, established a minimum age for a political career (the *cursus honorum*), probably 27. Under Sulla this was raised to 30—according to Varro, the end of *adulescentia*—while Augustus reduced it to 25, when in civil law the age of minority (*aetas minoris*) came to an end; so from then on majority under civil law and in politics coincided.

Such age-qualifications were not exclusive to the city of Rome. For the situation in the classical and Hellenistic Greek world, the study of P.Roussel¹⁵⁹ on the principle of seniority is very instructive. Just about everywhere, as seen in inscriptions as well as in literature, the rule held good that no public office could be held before the age of 30. So, when Sulla fixed the minimum age at 30, his aim was clearly to harmonize the Roman situation with the practice of the Greek world. From Augustus on, the minimum age of 25 was the law, not only in the city of Rome, but throughout the whole Empire.¹⁶⁰ To hold any public office at the municipal level or to have a seat as a *decurio* (city councillor) one had to be 25 (30 during the Republic). Legal texts are clear: 'It is not proper for

minores before their twenty-fifth year to be admitted to the administration of their community or to *munera* other than patrimonial, or to office.¹⁶¹ Even in AD 329 the age of 25 is mentioned as the minimum age, but some other texts from late antiquity mention an age-reduction to 20, 18 or even 16.¹⁶² Whether we have to do with a general reduction of age is not certain, because the texts refer in one case to the specific situation in Carthage, in all others to sons of veterans who wished to escape their military service and were 'punished' with the decurionate. Perhaps the 'normal' legal minimum age remained 25 until the end of antiquity.

So much for the rules. But in every period there were exceptions. What should we make of them? Quite simply, that they were indeed—real or apparent—exceptions, that it is not they that determine the image of youth. One swallow does not make a summer, and even many exceptions do not constitute the rule.

It is clear that there were real exceptions. I am thinking of Octavian, whose lightning career has been already discussed. It is clear that his seizure of power (like that of Pompey, for example) was considered by his contemporaries as most exceptional. This young man certainly did not accede to power because his youthful age was admired and respected; on the contrary, he succeeded *in spite of* his youthful age.

During the later Empire there seem to have been, in the East as well as in the West, many people under 25 who took part in political life. According to T.E.J. Wiedemann, this is proof that the distinction between adult citizens and children became less and less important; and according to M. Kleijwegt it proves that the Ancients did not know adolescence at all. How should we judge these statements?

At 25 one could become a quaestor—and enter the senate—from the time of Augustus on. The Republican magistracies continued to exist until the end of antiquity, but continually became less important until—certainly from AD 356, when the emperor no longer thought it worthwhile to appoint senators for these offices himself—no more than the name remained.¹⁶³ Real power now lay in the hand of the emperor's administration.¹⁶⁴ In view of these circumstances it is not surprising that the quaestorship and praetorship¹⁶⁵ were quite often entrusted to children, to honour the father—and get him to pay. Thus the son of Symmachus was quaestor at the age of 9, praetor at 17, but it is perfectly clear from several letters that it was the father—and not the son—who spared

neither money nor effort to make a success of the games his son had to organize.¹⁶⁶

Every city in the Roman Empire had its own city council and its own officials. During the Empire, we hear relatively often, in literary and (especially) epigraphical sources, of youths (and even children or toddlers)¹⁶⁷ who had a seat in the local council and occupied a variety of posts. Such exceptions were often only apparent, for in many cases such 'officials' themselves bore no—or hardly any—responsibility, or they were appointed because the number of full adults was insufficient.

Young officials illustrate the fact that the status of *senator*, *eques*, *decurio* gradually became hereditary at least *de facto*. Under the Empire a large number of posts became to an increasing degree nominal,¹⁶⁸ mainly—or exclusively—a question of wealth. The real work—if work there was—was carried out by a substitute adult. The father, who made himself serviceable (especially financially) to his city, was honoured in the person of his son. In many cases he will have been happy with this situation and even have made efforts to collect such 'sinecures' for his children. He who has power (and enjoys the advantages attached to it) wants to keep it, and to hand it on to his children when they become adults. The father wished the best for his son's future, hoped that his child would some day inherit his prestige and paid for it willingly.¹⁶⁹

As long as these functions were considered an honour, this was the ordinary state of affairs. However, from about AD 200 the financial burdens in many cases (and places) were no longer outweighed by the advantages and prestige attached to them. People did their utmost to escape from them; office-holding became less and less voluntary. The offices lost their prestige; honours (*honores*) became (burdensome) *munera*,¹⁷⁰ (semi-voluntary) obligations of an individual to the State or the municipality. Anyone, whether young or old, man or woman, ill or healthy, could be charged with a *munus patrimonii*, practically a kind of taxation on the estate, which required no mental or physical ability. Children and women were excluded from holding office, but were not excluded from giving concrete benefits to a community. There was an essential difference from other *munera*, the *munera personalia* or *mixta*, personal charges which demand a mental and/or physical ability and for which a minimum age of 25—in later periods 20,¹⁷¹ 18 or 16—was required.

In later antiquity, such offices (or *munera*) were considered such a burden that everyone who had the necessary money or connections tried to get out of them and hoped to find a more 'humane' existence in, for instance, the imperial civil service, the army or even the clergy.¹⁷² Young people were appointed to the decurionate and local offices, but often not voluntarily, sometimes even in their absence and against the will of their fathers, mainly because they (or their father) possessed money and there was a dearth of willing adult candidates. Necessity knows no law. We have to do with a symptom of the late Roman state of emergency. A reduction of the minimum age was applied in order to fill the *curia*, and thus to obtain the necessary finances. Typical is a passage from St. Basil who protests against the appointment of the not yet 4-year-old grandson of a retired decurion: 'For of course the child will not be counted among the senators, or collect taxes, or furnish provision-money for soldiers, but it will be necessary for the white locks of the unfortunate old man again to be put to shame.'¹⁷³

In conclusion: in normal circumstances real political responsibility was only given to real adults (normally people over 25). That young men below the age of 25 were not seen as real adults is evident from the fact that, in the same period in which young councillors and officials were not rare, the institution of the guardianship (*cura*) reached its full development. During the later Empire the difference between *impuberes* and *minores* (or *puberes*) largely disappeared in civil law. Young men were treated in the same way as children. How could they have been seen as adults? How could *minores* have borne real responsibility in politics? Let us remember the words of Dio Cassius (c. AD 200), already quoted: 'Is it not disgraceful, and indeed hazardous (*αἰσχρὸν καὶ σφαλερόν*) to entrust the public business to men younger than twenty-five, when we never commit our private affairs to any one before he has reached this age?'¹⁷⁴ That would have been bad policy, because, according to the legislator Ulpian (d. AD 228), 'all people agree that persons of this age are weak and deficient in sense and subject to many kinds of disadvantage'.¹⁷⁵

THE YOUNG MAN AT THE BAR¹⁷⁶

The most promising prospects for Roman youths of good stock lay in a political career or in the army, although this latter option was less

popular from the late Republic on. Virtually without exception they also dreamt of distinguishing themselves as orators.

Throughout the whole of antiquity oratorical skill was the key to success *par excellence*: it was *the* means of bringing ruin on others and securing one's own advancement. There was no better preparation for—or weapon in—a political career. During the Empire the practical value of eloquence was considerably reduced; the *orator* had to give way to the *rheto*r, but nonetheless the ability to speak in public remained the human talent held in highest esteem.

During the late Republic a young Roman tried to make his mark as a lawyer as early as possible and preferably sought to launch his career in a spectacular trial. A case in which a wellknown politician who had somewhat (or often not at all) blotted his copy-book was hauled before the courts, offered an ambitious young lawyer the means of making a name during the Republic; an appearance in such a trial was a virtually indispensable prelude to a political career. Referring to this republican tradition, Apuleius, in the second century AD, said of his accuser:

He does not accuse me to gain glory, as Cn. Carbo was accused by M.Antony, A.Albucius by C.Mucius, Cn. Norbanus by P.Sulpicius, M.Aquilius by C.Furius, Q. Metellus by C.Curio. These learned and highly ambitious young men initiated themselves in the forensic practice in such a way because they wanted to be known among the citizens by an important trial. This habit, which was allowed by our ancestors to young men at the beginning of their career to show their talents, has disappeared long since.¹⁷⁷

We hear of this practice in fact at an early stage. His contemporary and friend Polybius bears witness to the fact that the Younger Scipio, c. 168 BC, would have nothing to do with this 'sport': 'All the time that other young men gave up to law affairs and greetings, spending the whole day in the forum and thus trying to court the favour of the populace, Scipio was occupied by the chase.'¹⁷⁸ According to Plutarch, the Elder Cato, who in fact encouraged this practice, was hauled before the courts on no fewer than fifty occasions;¹⁷⁹ it was doubtless largely young men who made life difficult for this great statesman, who so regularly ranted and raved about the youth. As early as 187 BC, Scipio Asiaticus too had to

come to terms with the insults of young men (*adulescentium convicia*), who had denounced him before the law for embezzlement.¹⁸⁰ In 119 BC there was a sensational trial in which the 21-year-old Crassus denounced Papirius Carbo for his seditious tribunate and drove him to committing suicide.¹⁸¹

Numerous other spectacular trials could be recalled in this context. Suffice it to say that Cicero too began his career in this way.¹⁸² In the anarchic conditions which prevailed in his youth there was no one who dared take up the defence of Roscius Amerinus, a young man unjustly accused of parricide. On the advice of his friends, who saw here an opportunity for an ideal début, the 26-year-old Cicero agreed to be counsel for the defence and triumphed in the trial over Chrysogonus, a powerful protégé of Sulla, upon whose will life-or-death decisions hung in those days.¹⁸³

During the Empire, the less attractive bureaucracy aside,¹⁸⁴ the bar offered promising prospects to young men, not only to those of rank. For professional barristers the career offered prospects of enrichment and advancement. Not everybody was enthusiastic about the standard of the young advocates in those days, who were formed in the rhetorical schools. When still of tender years, youngsters tested their oratorical powers in the forum, where, according to Petronius, they were laughed at because at school they only 'played' (*pueri in scholis ludunt*); Roman parents too were, in his eyes, responsible for this decline of oratorical skill, 'for they refuse to allow their children to profit by stern discipline'. 'To begin with they consecrate even their young hopefuls, like everything else, to ambition. Then if they are in a hurry for the fulfilment of their wishes, they drive the unripe schoolboy (*cruda adhuc studia*) into the law courts, and thrust eloquence, the noblest (they confess) of callings, upon children who are still struggling into the world (*pueris adhuc nascentibus*).'¹⁸⁵ It is evident that these parents were not only driven by self-interest but also hoped their children would do better in life than they themselves had done. The case of young Lucian, which will be treated in another context,¹⁸⁶ makes it clear that oratory could in fact be an excellent means for social promotion.

Like Petronius, the Younger Pliny deplores the pitiable standard of the oratory of a large number of young (professional) lawyers. In a lively description of such lads, he declares why he lost his appetite for forensic activity:

There are very few people with whom it is any pleasure to appear if you consider the impudence of the rest—mostly unknown youngsters (*adulescentuli obscuri*) who have arrived in our midst to practice rhetoric: which they do with such effrontery and want of consideration that I think our friend Atilius summed them up well when he said that boys (*pueros*) begin their career at the bar with centumviral cases just as they start on Homer at school. In both places they put the hardest first. But in my time (as our elders always say), believe me, there was no place here for a young man, however well-born (*ne nobilissimis quidem adulescentibus*), unless a consular senator introduced him; so highly was a noble profession respected. Today the bars of propriety and deference are down, everything is open to all and sundry, and no introductions are needed for anyone to burst in.¹⁸⁷

The humane—and vain—Pliny, who was normally favourably disposed to the young,¹⁸⁸ comes across as pretty unenthusiastic in this excerpt. In his correspondence, however, quite a number of young people crop up who do not answer to this description. One has only to look at his letter concerning two of his ‘fans’ who had made impressive speeches in the forum:

This has been a happy day for me. I...heard two young men of outstanding ability and promise plead opposite each other. They were Fuscus Salinator and Ummidius Quadratus, a remarkable pair who are likely to prove an ornament not only to the present age but to literature itself. Both combined exceptional honesty with strength of character; their appearance was pleasant, their accent pure.... All this delighted me, as did the fact that they looked to me as their guide and teacher (*ut rectorem, ut magistrum*), and gave their hearers the impression that they sought to follow in my footsteps.¹⁸⁹

Young advocates faced a tough challenge when they came face to face with hardened professionals as opponents in the forum. Quintilian believed that one should go easy on younger opponents at a trial, ‘or at least appear to do so (*adulescentes parcere aut videri*)’.¹⁹⁰ The latter tactic especially was applied. Cicero, for

instance, addressed himself to the youthful Torquatus in condescending tones in his *Pro Sulla*:

I make some concession to your youth (*do adulescentiae*), I make some sacrifice to our friendship, I pay some regard to your father.... You are very well aware of my normal manner of speaking, so do not strain my unparalleled forbearance in this case; do not think that the stings of my rhetoric have been drawn, they have only been sheathed; do not think that the loss has been all mine in any allowance or concession that I have made to you. The excuses made for the injury you have inflicted carry conviction with me— your quick temper, your youth, our friendship—and I have decided that you are not yet powerful enough for me to need to come to grips and do battle with you. If you were older and more experienced, I should behave as I usually do under provocation.¹⁹¹

In another plea, the *Pro Caelio*, the great orator adapted an apparently sympathetic attitude to the 17-year-old Atratinus. This lad was either urged to make his indictment by Clodia; or he was motivated by love for his father, who had been dragged before the courts by Caelius on two occasions; or he was driven by naked ambition, something completely in keeping with his age (*pueritia*). Further on the great orator states that he is ‘amazed and grieved’ that, of all people, so young a man had to prove Caelius’ dissolute conduct:

For it was not in keeping with him, nor did his age call for it (*neque aetas illa postulabat*), nor, as you could see for yourself, did this excellent young man’s sense of propriety make him at home with language of this sort. I could wish that one of the more hardened among your accusers had taken upon himself the part of slanderer; we should have rather more freedom and force, and feel far more natural, in retorting upon such licence of an evil tongue. With you, Atratinus, I will deal more leniently, since your scruples restrain my language, and I feel bound also not to undo the kindness I have done you and your father. I should like, however, to give you a hint: first, in order that all may form a correct view of you, that, just as you are far from baseness in deed, you should keep yourself free from licence in word;

next, that you should not bring charges against another which you would blush to hear brought falsely against yourself. For who is there who does not find that road open? Who is there who cannot make some scandalous attack as impudently as he pleases against one of your years, and also of your personal charm, even if with no ground for suspicion, yet not without some basis of accusation? But the blame for the part you have played rests with those who desired you to play it; the credit belongs to your scruples, because we saw with what reluctance you spoke, and to your ability, because you spoke with such grace and refinement.¹⁹²

The young man who dared take his chance in the forum suffered not only from a sense of shame like Atratinus, but also, and even more, from stage-fright. In Terence we read how Phaedria believed it typical for a young man of good stock who appeared before the judges to come across as paralysed, so to speak, and incapable of presenting the case he had prepared.¹⁹³ Plutarch called this sort of paralysis a ‘youthful passion’ (νέου πάθος).¹⁹⁴ Crassus, the leading orator when Cicero was still a lad, suffered a lot from his nerves. He went pale whenever he had to start pleading, his whole body trembled and shuddered. When a mere 21, he was up against Papirius Carbo. He became so tongue-tied that he was eternally grateful to Q. Maximus for adjourning the case when he observed that sheer terror made the youth lost for words.¹⁹⁵ In this passage, with Crassus as his mouthpiece, Cicero makes it clear that an orator’s stage-fright did not bother him, quite the contrary: a good orator needs to be under a certain ‘stress’. Here, in fact, Cicero was speaking in his own defence because, as he wrote in the beginning of his speech on behalf of Deiotarus, ‘I am, when beginning to speak, usually more deeply moved than either my experience or my years would seem to warrant.’¹⁹⁶

The young Roman who launched legal proceedings against prominent citizens under the Republic was primarily driven by ambition, by the desire to acquire fame which would draw attention to him and by the longing to prove his worth to society. When writing about Caelius, Cicero made this unambiguous assertion: ‘It was his wish that, according to young men who rose to eminence in the State as its most illustrious citizens, his industry should be made known to the people of Rome by the outcome of some striking prosecution.’¹⁹⁷ Furthermore, the youth wanted to show that he had

courage, a virtue that was held in high esteem in Rome. The more perilous a law case, the more attractive it was and the more fame it guaranteed to the successful lawyer. Even during the Empire such risky pleas could be useful for a career. While still very young (*adulescentulus*) Pliny undertook the defence of Junius Pastor 'against men of great influence, some of them even also friends of the Emperor'. In spite of an inauspicious dream, he did not give up, believing that 'the best and only omen is to fight for one's country'. He won the case, and it was this speech that drew attention to him and set him on the threshold of a successful career.¹⁹⁸

In many cases ambition, courage and the desire to see justice done went hand in hand. That was the case with the young Pliny; that was also the case with Cicero, who took up the defence of Roscius Amerinus, accused of parricide at the instigation of the powerful Chrysogonus.

[The accusers] thought that defenders would fail him, in fact, they have. But a man who will speak freely, who will loyally defend him—and this is enough in this case—will certainly not fail him, gentlemen. Perhaps, in undertaking this case, I may have acted rashly under the impulse of youth (*temere impulsus adulescentia*); since, however, I have once undertaken it, though threats, terrors, and dangers of every kind menace me on every side, by Hercules! I will meet them and undergo them. I have deliberately made up my mind, not only to say all that I consider has to do with the case, but also to say it as I please, boldly and freely; no consideration shall arise of such importance, gentlemen, as to make it possible for fear to exert greater influence over me than honour. For is there a man so indifferent as to keep silence and take no notice at the sight of such atrocities?

His motives are still further analysed at the very beginning of his speech, where he says:

Gentlemen of the jury, you probably wonder why, when so many eminent orators and illustrious citizens remain seated, it is I, rather than any of them, who have risen to speak, though neither in age, nor ability, nor authority, can I be compared with them. All those whom you see here supporting the accused are of opinion that in this case an unjust charge,

concocted by an unexampled act of villainy, should be repelled, but dare not undertake the task themselves owing to the unfavourable conditions of the times. Hence it is that they are present in fulfilment of a duty, but remain silent because they are desirous of avoiding danger. What then? Am I the boldest of all? By no means. Or am I so much more eager to render a service than the rest? I am not so eager even for that title to praise, as to wish others to be deprived of it. What then was the reason that impelled me, more than anyone else, to undertake the defence of Sextus Roscius? The reason is this. If any of those whom you see here, in whom the highest authority and dignity are vested, had risen to speak and uttered a word about public affairs—a thing impossible to avoid doing in a case like this—it would be made out that he had said much more than he really did. On the other hand, as for me, even if I were to say freely all that there is to be said, my words will by no means be spread abroad in the same manner and become public property. In the next place, no word of theirs can pass unnoticed, owing to their rank and dignity, nor can any rashness of speech be allowed in their case owing to their age and ripe experience; whereas, if I speak too freely, my words will either be ignored, because I have not yet entered public life, or pardoned owing to my youth (*ignosci adulescentiae meae*), although not only the idea of pardon, but even the custom of legal inquiry has now been abolished from the State.¹⁹⁹

The young prosecuting lawyers were well aware that there were risks involved in arraigning prominent citizens before the courts. This fact transpires from Cicero's words quoted above, and it is also confirmed by the fact that, as Plutarch informs us, Cicero won the case but shortly afterwards—for health reasons, but also out of fear for his safety—set off on a study-trip to the East.²⁰⁰ According to Suetonius, Caesar too fled to Rhodes on a study-trip after he had lost his court case against Dolabella and thus had roused too much enmity in Rome.²⁰¹ When he defended his youthful friend Caelius, who had denounced Bestia, Cicero spoke as follows:

Would Caelius, if he had given himself to such a life as his accusers have described, while still quite a youngster, have brought to trial a man of consular rank? If he shrank from

labour, if he were fast bound in the fetters of pleasure, would he day by day be active here in combat, brave hostilities, prosecute, or risk the issue of a criminal trial?²⁰²

One could say that these risks attracted rather than deterred. But it was not only the accuser who was playing with fire, the case might also render a poor service to the accused. This happened when the 21-year-old Licinius Crassus arraigned C. Carbo before the court and thereby drove him to take his own life, a consequence Crassus was later to regret bitterly. It was Cicero's view that he had behaved like many young men at a stage when they are still not fully mature intellectually, at a stage where virtue and integrity are less developed than among adults, when they are not yet aware how much happier life is for someone who does not usually denounce and who, in turn, is not spied upon by everyone.²⁰³

Generally speaking, public opinion was favourably disposed to a young man who attempted to come into the limelight by launching legal proceedings for, as Cicero wrote, 'that time of life is accustomed to find favour rather than to meet with opposition (*non modo non invidetur illi aetati, verum etiam favetur*)'.²⁰⁴ One was prepared to overlook a great deal in his case, his tender years were an acceptable excuse. Besides it was deemed highly praiseworthy that a young man should attempt to take his revenge on his father's accusers, as M. Cotta had done on the day he took the adult toga.²⁰⁵ According to Quintilian denunciations made in the name of the state were also loudly applauded, and were seen both as a patriotic deed and as denoting upright character.²⁰⁶ We read in Plutarch that the office of public prosecutor was seen in a poor light, but nonetheless the Romans 'were very desirous to see their young men fastening themselves on malefactors like high-bred whelps on wild beasts'.²⁰⁷

III

THE LEISURE ACTIVITIES OF YOUTH¹

From an early stage the young man of rank in Roman society had considerable free time, most of which was devoted to recreational activities which his elders often frowned upon. It will be seen how he cut himself off sometimes (though not always) from the world of the child, as well as from that of the adult, so as virtually to seal himself in an adolescent ‘cocoon’, a ‘psycho-social moratory’ (E.Erikson).

SPORTS AND ATHLETICS²

‘Building toy-houses, harnessing mice to a wee cart, playing odd and even, riding a long stick—if these things delighted a bearded man, lunacy would plague him.’³ Not only a *barbatus vir* but already an *inberbus iuvenis* put such childish games behind him when he adopted the adult toga.⁴ Yet, like the child, the Roman adolescent enjoyed intense physical activity and had more than enough opportunities for burning off surplus physical energy.

‘The beardless youth...finds joy in horses and hounds and the grass of the sunny Campus.’⁵ It is clear from Horace’s characterization of the *inberbus iuvenis* that Roman youngsters liked the sports on the Campus Martius, a wide, open plain on the banks of the Tiber. The place offered ample opportunities for sport-loving youths to engage in activities such as horse-riding, chariot-driving, running, jumping, wrestling, boxing, archery and other ‘martial’ arts.⁶

The activities listed were all ‘manly’ sports which were an integral part of ancient Roman tradition and had not been imported by the Greeks (unlike athletics). These sports were all very fashionable, even if the young often did not see them so much as a military training, and even if the pull exerted by amorous

involvements was sometimes stronger, as the following poem by Horace clearly indicates:

In the name of all gods, tell me, Lydia, why you are bent on ruining Sybaris with love; why he hates the sunny Campus, he who once was patient of the dust and sun; why he rides no more among his soldier mates, nor restrains the mouth of the Gallic steed with jagged bit! Why does he fear to touch the yellow Tiber? Why does he shun the wrestling-oil more warily than viper's blood, nor longer show his arms bruised with weapon practice, he who once was famed for hurling, oft the discus, oft the javelin, beyond the farthest mark? Why does he skulk, as they say the son of the sea-born Thetis did?⁷

From this poem it becomes evident that swimming,⁸ too, was a favourite pastime of youngsters, even though it was never practised as a sport as such. The Tiber flowed right next to the Campus, and the young men trooped off to the river to refresh themselves and wash off the dust, sweat and oil which covered their bodies after all their physical exertions.⁹

One could also find people swimming in the public baths (*thermae*) and in seaside resorts. Where swimming in the public baths was concerned, there were not always separate facilities for men and for women. Ovid thus saw the baths as offering an ideal meeting-place for men and women looking for a bit of sex on the side (*furtivos iocos*).¹⁰ The regularity with which new laws against mixed bathing were issued¹¹ would suggest that things got out of hand from time to time. This was the case during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, who, by forbidding this practice, reacted, according to his biographer, against 'the loose morals of married women and youths of rank (*mores matronarum... diffuentes et iuvenum nobilium*)'.¹²

Right to the end of antiquity Baiae in particular was famous—and notorious—as a fashionable spa and seaside resort. It is clear from Cicero's plea for Caelius that young people especially made their presence felt there. The notorious Clodia had gathered the *jeunesse dorée* around her and enjoyed residing in this town. The way she held court gave rise to all sorts of gossip: Rome was rife with rumours of orgies, amorous liaisons, revelry, boat-trips, serenades and concerts with which this famous matron and her lovers amused themselves there.¹³

A conservative Roman could only applaud when a young man showed enthusiasm for the hunt.¹⁴ Was there any better training for a military life? According to Pliny, hunting was *the* pastime of youth in days of old: 'This was the training and the delight of youth (*experientia, voluptas iuventutis*), these were the skills which formed the leaders of the future—to pit speed against an animal's swift-footedness, and strength and dexterity against its courage and cunning; while in times of peace it brought no small honour to sweep marauding wild beasts from the plains and raise the siege they laid to the farmers and their work.'¹⁵

As a sport, hunting was a relatively new phenomenon in the Roman world. It was introduced, in fact, as we know from Polybius, by a youth, the 17-year-old Scipio Minor, who was initiated into the art of hunting by the cream of the Greek nobility during his stay in Macedonia 168 BC. 'Being of the right age and physique', he became virtually obsessed with this hobby, which continued after his return to Rome, where he tried to acquire reputation for courage—the Roman virtue *par excellence*—through his hunting skills: 'All the time that other young man gave up to law affairs'¹⁶... Scipio was occupied by the chase, and by his brilliant and memorable exploits, acquired a higher reputation than anyone.'¹⁷

In the days of the early Empire, Horace complained that lads of rank had lost the knack of horse-riding and hunting and only got pleasure from playing with the Greek hoop or with dice.¹⁸ He was undoubtedly exaggerating, for in fact hunting stayed a favourite pastime among the young and was to remain so throughout the Empire. The biographer of Marcus Aurelius, for instance, relates that the main hobby of young Marcus was hunting, while he also took great pleasure in boxing, wrestling, running, bird-catching and ball-games; his 'conversion' to philosophy when he was 25 put an end to all these leisure activities.¹⁹

There are numerous examples which suggest that in late antiquity the passion for hunting even increased. Paulinus of Pella relates how an illness at 16 prevented him from pursuing his studies and how he was given free rein to indulge his youthful longings (*iuvenilia desideria*) and gave all his time to horses with fancy equipment, stable-masters, hounds and falcons.²⁰ Symmachus, for his part, was of the opinion that it was unbecoming for mature people to squander their time and energy on hunting, but felt that it admirably suited the young (*iuvenalis industriae est; aetatibus*

vestris hic labor convenit), and was to be chosen in preference to any of the Greek sports such as the gaming-board, the ball, the trundling-hoop and the wrestling-schools.²¹

The sports on the Campus Martius and hunting won the warm approval of the traditional Romans, who saw these pastimes as—in theory, at least—an excellent preparation for military service. They took a very different view of athletics, which, together with music, occupied a key position in the Greek educational system,²² something never true of Rome. Athletics as practised in the gymnasia and palaestras was an end in itself, pure entertainment, practised with a view to achieving a beautiful, elegant, shapely body, rather than a hardened body. Therefore, we read in Plutarch,

the Romans considered nothing to be the cause of the Greeks' enslavement and degeneracy as much as the gymnasia and palaestras, which gave rise to much time wasting and laziness in the cities, and also profligacy, paederasty, and the ruination of the youths' bodies through sleep, strolls, eurhythmic exercises, and precise diets, because of which they stopped practising with weaponry and were happy to be called nimble and wrestlers and handsome instead of hoplites and good horsemen.²³

As was usually the case, the resistance of the conservatives was doomed to failure. Increasingly Greek athletics and typical Greek distractions such as playing with the hoop and the ball²⁴ belonged to the 'exercises of youths' (*exercitia iuventutis*).²⁵ That this continued to be the case in late antiquity appears from Symmachus' testimony quoted above.²⁶

However, even during the Empire, conservative Romans continued to manifest opposition to professional athletics, as we read in, for example, H.A.Harris: 'While the young men of these [the higher] classes were quite willing to engage in some of the Greek events for amusement, they had a poor opinion of the professionals who practised them for a living.'²⁷ Nero did try to meet these objections, and took steps to introduce athletics into the mainstream of Roman life, but when he tried to inaugurate gymnastic games on the Greek model in AD 60, he roused the ire of the conservatives and was accused of introducing licentiousness: 'Youth, under the influence of foreign tastes, should degenerate into votaries of the gymnasia, of indolence, and of dishonourable amours—and this at

the instigation of the emperor and senate.... What remained but to strip to the skin as well, put on the gloves, and practise that mode of conflict instead of the profession of arms?'²⁸

Many (wealthy) youths did not lose any sleep over such objections from Romans of the old guard and were regular visitors to palaestras and gymnasia.²⁹ In any case, even so distinguished a pedagogue as Quintilian makes no objection to moderate frequentation of these establishments; he warns, however, against excess and paints an all but flattering picture of the 'loafers' who dull their spirits by their exaggerated body culture and divide their time between the wine and oil of the *gymnasia*.³⁰ Martial describes a certain Atticus as a truly exceptional case: this young man confined himself to simple running exercises, did not waste his time on all sorts of useless gymnastic exercises and did not throw away his money on masseurs and wrestling teachers who charged exorbitant fees.³¹

It ought to be pointed out that during the specific period at issue here, even in the Greek world athletics had lost prestige, at least as a pedagogical instrument.³² Most eloquent is the physician Galen, who doubtless expresses the opinion of many physicians and philosophers of his (and earlier) days. In his eyes, athletes were brutes who live as 'brainless beasts', as pigs, 'except for the fact that the pigs do not work beyond measure or eat under force'. He felt that a youngster who wished to avoid being considered a 'barbarian' should choose an intellectual profession, preferably medicine, although rhetoric, music, geometry, mathematics, literature, law and even sculpture or painting were acceptable, since none of these occupations required excessive physical effort. He lamented the fact that certain young men, 'remarkable for their beauty', neglected the training of their minds, and expressed the fear that some of them actually dreamt of becoming athletes.³³ A philosopher like Epictetus had pupils of this kind. He spoke out against youths who, like children, mimicked everything, and every second day boasted a new Vocation': today they are dreaming of being a gladiator or athlete, tomorrow they will want to be an orator, the day after tomorrow a philosopher.³⁴

Despite Galen's polemics, and despite an increasing specialization, commercialization and professionalism, athletics were still always very popular and, as H.W.Pleket has shown, the social status of the professionals remained high in the Greek part of the Empire.³⁵ Yet there was some 'democratization'. Athletics (like

music) were no longer the monopoly of the elite. From the second-century author Artemidorus we can deduce that a future in the army was quite normal for a poor boy, an appointment in the state bureaucracy not unusual for an upper-class youth, while a lad from a middle-class background (*μέτριος*)—but certainly not exclusively such a youngster—might become an athlete.³⁶

In most festivals the athletes were divided into age-categories, usually two (children and men) but often three (children, beardless youths (*ἀγένετοι*), men) or even more.³⁷ Some of the top performers could clock up an impressive record of achievements. Marcus Aurelius Asclepiades, for example, a native of Alexandria, who was a champion in pankration (an ‘all-in’ contest in boxing and wrestling) in the second century AD, belonged to this elite. An inscription mentions his (mostly nominal) functions and sporting exploits:

I was senior temple guardian of the great Serapis, high priest of the world-wide Xystus of athletes, xystarch for life, keeper of the Imperial Baths, citizen of Alexandria [where he was also a member of the prestigious Alexandrian Museum, a sort of Academy of Arts and Science],³⁸ of Hermopolis, Puteoli and Naples, senator of Elis and Athens, Hermopolis, Puteoli and Naples, and citizen and senator of many other cities. I was a *periodonikes* [one who gains victories in all the great games], undefeated in the pankration. I was never dismissed from the ring in a ‘no contest’ and never disqualified, but won every event for which I entered. I never appealed for a foul, nor did anyone ever dare to appeal against me for a foul. I never drew a fight nor made a protest nor scratched nor withdrew, nor did I ever undertake a contest to win royal favour. I never won after a fresh fight had been ordered, but was always crowned in the ring in every event for which I entered, and I was always approved in the preliminary investigations before these events. I competed in three countries, Italy, Greece and Asia.

His record of achievements is really impressive: he won once in Pisa and Delphi; twice in Isthmia, Nemea, Argos, Rome, Puteoli, Naples, Nicopolis; three times in Pergamum and Ephesus; five times in Athens and Smyrna, etc. This ‘super-athlete’ of antiquity clocked up all these achievements in a career which lasted a mere six years.

His career came to an end when he was only 25 'because of the risks and the jealousies which I encountered'.³⁹

MUSIC AND DANCE⁴⁰

In the Greek pedagogical system music occupied almost as important a place as athletics. While physical exercises were seen as a contribution to the harmonious development of the human body, music and dance were viewed as contributing to the development of the spirit.⁴¹ The Romans, however, never admitted that music had quite the same moral and ethical value. It goes without saying that, like all peoples, they too had their native songs, but from relatively early on their solemn, martial music could not compare with the more refined musical tradition of Greece and the East.

The traditional Roman was virulently opposed to this imported music. A 'true' Roman neither danced or sang, and certainly not in the Greek fashion! The young, however, did not care about the traditional reservations. Polybius relates how, despite the opposition of Cato the Censor, a large section of the youth towards 168 BC was enthusiastic about everything which came from Greece, including Hellenic dance and music.⁴² Schools of dancing were opened at about that time, and even the humane Scipio Minor was alarmed at the trend: 'What our young men and girls learn is improper display of their bodies. They frequent these schools of acting in the company of brazen dancers; they take flutes and stringed instruments along and learn singing there; these are things which our ancestors always considered dishonourable for freeborn youngsters (*quae maiores nostri ingenuis probro ducier voluerunt*).'⁴³

As with so many other issues, here, too, the opposition of the conservative Roman was to no avail. Increasingly, dancing and singing were to become features of the *bon ton*, essential skills which the worldly young man—and young lady—simply had to possess. During the Empire, demands were even made that these skills should be included in the instruction offered to the young. Quintilian, for example, felt that they afforded an outstanding means of grooming the voice and physical movements of the future orator; he did think, however, that this instruction should be limited to the years of childhood, and opted for traditional 'heroic' music, which could whip up or calm passions. He absolutely rejected the effeminate, voluptuous 'modern' music which reigned

supreme in the theatre of his day because it drained away the last drop of virility.⁴⁴

It may be questioned whether Quintilian found much response among contemporary youths, who were primarily attracted to modern music. In Seneca the Elder's pen portrait of the foppish youth of his day (*desidiosa iuventus*) he specifically mentions their passion for music and dance.⁴⁵

Such a music fan was Nero. He was so devoted to his 'vocation' as an artist that he sacrificed the care of the *imperium* for its sake. Like many of his contemporaries, he had already received instruction in music as a child. On coming to the throne at the age of 17, he immediately summoned Terpnus, the finest zither-player of the day. Day after day he listened, with fascination, to this musician's singing and playing until the small hours. By practising constantly and by the observance of all sorts of dietary prescriptions, he tried to give volume to his rather weak voice.⁴⁶

In any event Nero was not an exceptional case. Let it suffice to mention only two testimonies from late antiquity. The sophist Libanius was annoyed by the fact that his students showed no interest in his speeches and took pleasure in nothing but the latest 'hits'.⁴⁷ There is a somewhat amusing anecdote about the 17-year-old Licentius, a pupil of Augustine at Cassiciacum. We shall meet the youth again as someone who was obsessed by poetry, but here we have to mention his love for music. One day he was haunted by a psalm-verse which he sang joyfully and resonantly (and out of tune) over and over again and everywhere, even when using the toilet, to the great annoyance of the Church Father's mother, Monica.⁴⁸

THE SPECTACLES⁴⁹

A major part of the young Roman's (busy) recreational timetable was taken up by the games. When Tacitus tried to explain the general decline in eloquence, he felt he had discovered a clue in the fact that the young people were infected with slothfulness (*desidia iuventutis*) and obsessed by the games so that they simply could not get enthusiastic about anything more elevating:

Again, there are the peculiar and characteristic vices of this metropolis of ours, taken on, as it seems to me, almost in the mother's womb—the passion for play-actors, and the mania for gladiatorial shows and horse-racing; and when the mind is

engrossed in such occupations, what room is left over for higher pursuits? How few are to be found whose home-talk runs to any other subjects than these? What else do we overhear our younger men talking about whenever we enter their lecture-halls? And the teachers are just as bad. With them, too, such topics supply material for gossip with their classes more frequently than any others; for it is not by the strict administration of discipline, or by giving proof of their ability to teach, that they get pupils together, but by pushing themselves into notice at morning calls and by the tricks of toadyism.⁵⁰

Tacitus had educational rather than moral objections to attendance at spectacles. It was thought quite normal that a young man should spend a fair amount of his free time attending the games. A different view was taken of his wanting to participate himself. Yet, as will be seen, this was a regular occurrence.

The circus⁵¹

It is self-evident that the races held in the circus exercised a fascination upon the young men. The races admirably fulfilled their need for excitement, acting as an emotional outlet. It is easy to imagine how worked up they could get, their anxiety if something went wrong, and their unrestrained delight when their hero carried the day. According to Juvenal, the cheering, the betting and the presence of smartly dressed young ladies all combined to increase the attractiveness of races for youths.⁵²

From the days of the early Caesars right until after the fall of the Western Roman Empire, Rome—and indeed all of the then known world—was divided into supporters' clubs (*factiones*), the Whites, the Greens, the Blues and the Reds, who virtually replaced the earlier political parties and managed to arouse as much, if not more, passion. Among the fans of note were the young Caligula, who had pledged his heart to the Greens,⁵³ and Nero, regarding whom more will be seen shortly. Equally fanatical were Caracalla and Geta, sons of the Emperor Septimius Severus. According to Herodian, they were corrupted by the thirst for luxury, so prevalent in Rome, and by their unrestrained enthusiasm for theatre, dancing and horse-racing. They were never able to get on well with one another. As children they had the usual rows, and

there was intense rivalry in the cock-fights they organized. Once, as youths, they could enjoy increased freedom, they threw themselves into a life of complete licentiousness. They caused scandal by their conduct with women and boys, embezzled money and chose charioteers and gladiators as their favourite companions. Their obsession with spectacles of all sorts forced them into a constant rivalry. It was sufficient for one of them to opt for a given side for the other to choose the opposite. They even went so far as to enter into competition with one another in chariot-races. The contest was so grim that Caracalla one day fell from his horse and broke a leg. Both brothers had a group of supporters in their train and these kept the spirit of rivalry alive, stirred up their sense of enjoyment and egged them on to rejoice in 'the pleasures of youth' (τὸ ἡδὺ τῆς ἡλικίας) Severus looked on all this activity with distress. He put pressure on Caracalla to marry, 'in the hope of getting him to lead a more regular life-style through matrimony', but this appeared a vain hope because, according to Herodian, his son entered marriage by having his arm twisted, not by free choice. The emperor spent as much time as he could away from Rome, in the hope that a sojourn in the countryside would 'cure' them of their passion for all sorts of spectacles, 'a passion quite unbecoming in sons of the emperor', but even the country air could not cool their passion and their mutual envy.⁵⁴

It goes without saying that a passion for chariot-races was not the monopoly of the emperor's sons. Also mesmerized by the charms of the circus was Augustine's youth friend Alypius, who was, as we shall see, also obsessed by the cruel games in the amphitheatre.⁵⁵ From Libanius' works it transpires very clearly that his students were wild about the races and that they idolized the charioteers.⁵⁶

The circus games survived the fall of the Western Roman Empire. Procopius provides important information in this regard. 'Every city', according to this historian, 'was divided of old into two parties, the Blues and the Greens'.⁵⁷ Obviously all the inhabitants of a city such as Constantinople (c. half a million) could not be accommodated in the circus, which had room for no more than 100,000 supporters. A. Cameron is undoubtedly correct when she writes: 'Considerations of general probability and the many analogies in subsequent history might suggest that these extremists would be young people.' This supposition, the English scholar continues, is 'overwhelmingly' supported by the sources, which often state emphatically that it was youths who were involved, 'young men with

time on their hands', the *jeunesse dorée*. 'In every age it is above all the young who are credited with just the sort of violent behaviour which our sources ascribe to the Blues and the Greens of the early Byzantine world.' And by way of illustration Cameron refers to the soccer hooligans of our own day.⁵⁸

Information of earlier periods gives fewer direct indications concerning the age of these 'hooligans', but the same scholar claims, in my opinion correctly, that here too the supporters' clubs were largely made up of young people, 'teenagers' as she calls them.⁵⁹

We discussed the passion felt by young men for the happenings in the circus. The charioteers, like the gladiators in the arena, were usually comparatively young men of low background who, given the risky nature of the races, often met with an early death. They were enormously popular, and equestrian sport was the noble sport *par excellence*, so it comes as no surprise that young men of rank also desired to participate actively in the horse-races. During Caesar's time, and also later under Augustus, young men from the top ranks of the nobility (*nobilissimi iuvenes*) appeared in the circus, where they demonstrated their competence as charioteers.⁶⁰ To the extent that this participation was a demonstration of prowess in the martial arts, it was tolerated and even encouraged. However, it was not at all appropriate for an aristocratic Roman to consider himself a professional charioteer. When Nero did so, he went beyond the bounds of good taste and created a scandal.

From his tenderest youth the future emperor was simply obsessed by the circus. Even though he was forbidden to mention the subject, he actually talked of hardly anything else. On one occasion the boy was caught by his teacher complaining about an accident involving a charioteer from the Green camp. He got out of a tight corner by claiming that he had been talking about Hector, the Trojan hero who had been dragged along by Achilles. At the beginning of his principate his daily amusement was to play with ivory horses on a miniature race-course, and he was present at even the most insignificant games, at first on the sly, later quite openly.⁶¹

It was only to be expected that Nero should dream of participating himself one day. Seneca and Burrus, his tutors, opposed his plan with might and main, as indeed they also opposed his musical hobby (in their eyes an even more scandalous amusement), but for Nero both music and driving a chariot were worthy of a god. 'And still', wrote Tacitus, 'there was no way of holding him back when Seneca and Burrus thought it judicious to

indulge one of his wishes so as to avoid his getting his own way with both.' He was allowed to practise in a sealed-off area, far from the public gaze. The young emperor was none too happy with this solution. Soon spectators, eager for a bit of scandal, were admitted, and they approved his exploits with a thunderous applause. 'The fact that Nero threw away his good name did not mean that he had too much of a good thing, as Seneca and Burrus had expected; on the contrary it only encouraged him.'⁶²

Nero forced aristocratic Romans to appear in the arena and on the stage, as Caesar and others had already done.⁶³ In 59 AD, when he was at the age of 22, he appeared for the first time in the gardens of his own palace during the *iuvenilia* ('youth games') organized by himself. Later he was to appear in Naples and Rome, and to take the show on a tour in Greece, the only country which, according to him, was fit to appreciate his art.⁶⁴ The *augustiniani* saw to it that his success was guaranteed:

Nero selected some young men of the order of the knights and more than five thousand sturdy young commoners, to be divided into groups and learn the Alexandrian styles of applause (they called them 'the bees', 'the roof-tiles', and the 'bricks'), and to ply them vigorously whenever he sang. These men were noticeable for their thick hair and fine apparel; their left hands were bare without rings, and the leaders were paid four hundred thousand sesterces each.⁶⁵

In recent years a number of scholars have attempted a reassessment of Nero. It is possible that he felt a genuine call to 'civilize' his compatriots, to acquire a new life-style based on athletics, poetry, music and dancing, but the conservative Romans found such a life-style beneath the dignity of a Roman.⁶⁶ In any case there is universal agreement that the young Nero was a talented young man, and it is clear that he was much beloved by the populace. Years after his death, admirers still laid flowers on his grave.⁶⁷

The theatre⁶⁸

Tacitus' criticism of the exaggerated interest youth had in the theatre has already been quoted.⁶⁹ He was referring, in the first instance, to mimes and pantomimes. The artists who appeared in these spectacles, in performances which had pronounced erotic

overtones and in which music and dancing occupied an important place, managed virtually to drive 'classical' theatre completely from the stage under the Empire.

Most of the young people had a fanatical admiration for these actors. There were exceptions, however. Typical of a certain type of youth was the young Quadratus as described by Pliny. His worldly grandmother was able to support a pantomime troupe, yet she despatched her grandson to his room whenever they were performing, not only out of affection but also, according to Pliny, out of respect for him (*non amore eius magis quam reverentia*). The young Quadratus was not unduly upset by this because he quite simply did not want to attend these performances, whether at home or in the theatre.⁷⁰ He can be compared to some extent with the youthful Emperor Valentinian, as portrayed in laudatory terms by Ambrose. When this young man learned that the noble youth of Rome were going hysterical about a certain actress, he was anxious to restrain their vices (*vitia adulescentium*). He summoned the actress and dismissed her without even having watched her show. According to Ambrose, it was his intention to set an example to the young and to restrain them from loving a woman whom he himself held in contempt, even though he—the emperor!—could easily have taken her as his beloved, especially as he was not yet tied by matrimony.⁷¹

The examples given above are probably not unique, but they can hardly be considered as representative of the average young man. Seneca, for instance, speaks about youths of the highest rank (*nobilissimos iuvenes*) who live as the slaves of pantomimes,⁷² and in Aulus Gellius a wealthy youth (*dives adulescens*) is reprimanded for idolizing comic and tragic actors and musicians, for being always with them and—how scandalous!—considering them as freemen.⁷³

The spell which actors were able to cast over certain young people emerges clearly from Libanius. In one of his speeches he discussed *claqueurs*, who saw to the applause in the theatres of Antioch. They were foreigners who as children had lived off their charms, but who needed another source of income with the onset of puberty. A few were keen on farces, but the majority made up the huge pantomime fan-club. They were at the beck and call of the dancers, waited on them hand and foot, obeyed them, responded to their every whim, were totally dependent on them. Once they themselves had become totally corrupted, they tried to get other young people to share their admiration for the performers, got them to neglect their studies and

encouraged them to steal as much as they could from their parents or, if the latter died, to hand over the parental fortune to the troupe. According to our author, ruin was brought upon a large number of families in this way.⁷⁴

Like the gladiators, the athletes and the charioteers, the actors had their fan-clubs. Riots in the theatre were not exceptional. Understandably, youth put up a good show. Proof is furnished by the third-century AD lawyer Callistratus, who promulgated tough measures against people who called themselves commonly (or everywhere?) *iuvenes*—*qui volgo se iuvenes appellant*, and behaved in a seditious and turbulent manner (*seditiose et turbulente se gesserint*) in the theatres of several towns: strokes of the cane and expulsion from the theatre for a first delict, banishment or even the death penalty for recidivists.⁷⁵

The example of Nero, as seen above,⁷⁶ suggests that the involvement of youth of rank in theatrical life was not always confined to the role of spectators. Already early in Roman history - in 364 BC—youth introduced in Rome the *satira*, a primitive comic stage-show which was a mixture of music, dance and improvised dialogues (*fescennini*).⁷⁷ However, as soon as professionals performed comedies and tragedies influenced by the Greeks, Roman citizens were forbidden by law to appear on the stage. Nero broke with this taboo, and he was not alone in doing so. Already in the days of Tiberius there were young people of equestrian or senatorial background who voluntarily renounced their rank in order to escape the law and appear as actors or gladiators.⁷⁸

The amphitheatre⁷⁹

Just like the chariot-races, and even more than theatrical shows, the gladiatorial games were forever popular with the Romans. These spectacles have been considered by moderns as *the* blot which besmirched Roman civilization, but, as L. Robert has shown, they were equally popular in the Greek world.⁸⁰ Few indeed were the Ancients who complained about the cruelties of the amphitheatre. One of them was Seneca, who exclaims: 'Man, a sacred being, is killed there for pleasure and entertainment'.⁸¹ Most people did not really consider the gladiators as human beings, so that for the Ancients the gladiatorial games were no more cruel than bull-fighting is in modern times. Even such a humane person as Pliny, supporting the propaganda for Vespasian's successor, praised the

Emperor Trajan for having set up a game of this kind, 'a public entertainment, nothing lax or dissolute to weaken and destroy the manly spirit of his subjects, but one to inspire them to face honourable wounds and look scorn on death, by exhibiting love of glory and desire for victory even in the persons of criminals and slaves'.⁸²

It is safe to assume that a large number of young people were addicted to the thrills of the amphitheatre and were among the most fanatical and pitiless of the spectators. This fact emerges clearly from an extract from Tacitus cited earlier.⁸³ According to Flavius Josephus, even a 'mad' emperor like Caligula was adored by women and young people because of the way he spoiled his subjects with distributions of food, all sorts of shows, and gladiatorial games.⁸⁴

The Rufinus on whom Apuleius vented so much spleen in his *Apology* must have been a hardened fan. From the very moment he acquired the adult toga, he scandalously abused his newly attained freedom. He was constantly present at gladiatorial exercises, knew all the gladiators by name, was familiar with their past fights and their wounds. Even though he came from a good background, he went through a course of training under the supervision of an experienced gladiator.⁸⁵ Libanius was certainly an exception when, aged 15, he was so absorbed in his studies that the theatre, the chariot-races and the gladiatorial games held no charms for him, even though they were actually organized by his uncle.⁸⁶

In the *Confessions* of Augustine one can see a fine example of the influence the games could exert on a young man. In Carthage, Augustine's friend and pupil Alypius was completely sold on the circus games, yet, under the influence of his teacher and 'idol', he was healed of his frenzy.⁸⁷ Then later, when twenty years old, he went to pursue his studies in Rome and came under the spell of the amphitheatre. Initially he felt only disgust for these spectacles. One fine day he met a group of fellow-students on their way to the arena who, with a bit of 'comradely violence' (*familiari violentia*), persuaded him to come along. After putting up a bit of resistance, he gave in: 'If you drag my body to that place and set me down there, do not imagine you can turn my mind and my eyes to those spectacles. I shall be as one not there, and so I shall overcome both you and the games.' As Augustine observed with keen psychological insight, his friends, now positive that he was coming along, were curious to see whether or not he would be able to keep his word. In the amphitheatre passions were at fever pitch. Alypius closed his

eyes but, according to our Church Father, ‘would that he had blocked his ears as well!’. For upon the fall of a gladiator the amphitheatre reverberated with applause and Alypius opened his eyes ‘supposing himself strong enough to despise whatever he saw and to conquer it’. But as soon as he saw the blood

he at once drank in savagery and did not turn away. His eyes were riveted. He imbibed madness. Without any awareness of what was happening to him, he found delight in the murderous contest and was inebriated by bloodthirsty pleasure. He was not now the person who had come in, but just one of the crowd which he had joined, and a true member of the group which had brought him in. What should I add? He looked, he yelled, he was on fire, he took the madness home with him so that it urged him to return not only with those by whom he had originally been drawn there, but even more than them, taking others with him.⁸⁸

A very poor view intellectuals took of people who descended into the arena as professionals. Those who appeared there were mostly convicts, prisoners-of-war and slaves, ex-prisoners and freedmen. One also met among the gladiators young people of better station who, driven by pure desire for a fight, an unhealthy thirst for fame or need of money, really wanted to be gladiators. These dare-devils of the amphitheatre were extremely popular, not least with women.⁸⁹ Some saw appearing as a gladiator as a means of getting into the public eye, of becoming a conversation topic, of polishing up one’s image. Often, too, this was the only way of recovering the money they had so scandalously frittered away. This fact is apparent in the consolation offered by Seneca to a father who had lost his son. He was a most exemplary young man and could have made progress in a virtuous life. However, there was great danger that he would be just like so many youths and, as a result of a debauched and prodigal life, would probably end up in the arena.⁹⁰ Elsewhere the same author indignantly speculated as to what someone like Cato the Censor would think of the present-day dandies (*trossuli*) who, with an army of runners and Numidian horsemen in tow, left clouds of dust in their wake. They were living in the lap of luxury, a luxury more comfortable than Cato ever knew, but their only concern was whether they should descend into the arena with the sword or with the casting-net.⁹¹

As was the case with the games at the circus or shows at the theatre, the emperors also played their part in the arena. For once the 'star performer' was not Nero but Caligula,⁹² and above all, Commodus, whose passion for the gladiatorial games reached fever-pitch. He killed thousands of wild animals, even elephants, in the course of his 'career', and appeared as a gladiator on countless occasions. These activities were usually performed in private, and thus there was no reason for him to recoil from all the bloodshed. But whenever he appeared in public before a large group of spectators, he used a blunt weapon so as not to kill his opponent. He was inordinately proud of the title 'gladiator' which had been conferred upon him. By the time of his death when he was 31, he had made more than a thousand appearances, ever triumphant of course, but already before the death of his father, Marcus Aurelius, when he was a mere 19, he had already 365 victories to boast of.⁹³

DANDIES, REVELLERS AND SPENDTHRIFTS⁹⁴

Appearance⁹⁵

A.Cameron's comment on Procopius' description of the extravagant, 'Hunnish' cloaks, hairdressing and—especially—shoes of the supporters of the Blues in sixth-century Constantinople is worth citing: 'These are all the sort of extreme fashions that point to the young. Fancy clothes and hair-dresses are a time-honoured form of group identification among the young.'⁹⁶ It will not be difficult to illustrate what she says for the Roman world.

The youthful dandy was a permanent fixture in Roman antiquity from c. 200 BC. A young man likes to be fashionable and is frequently the subject of comment on account of the exaggerated or striking attention he pays to his appearance.

It has been seen how Polybius indicated that wealthy youth from the first half of the second century BC welcomed everything from the Greek world with open arms.⁹⁷ Diodorus of Sicily wrote that the youngsters of that period had finished with war, and instead had surrendered themselves to a soft, luxurious life (*εἰς τρυφήν καὶ ἀκολασίαν*) choosing prodigality rather than sobriety of life-style. Costly parties were organized at which sweet-smelling perfumes, expensive coloured draperies, and dining-

couches of precious metal were used, and the best wine and the most mouth-watering delicacies were consumed in an orgy of gluttony and abandon. In the forum they appeared in exceptionally soft, translucent clothes, dressed for all the world like women. The prices asked for luxury items shot up, so popular were they with young people.⁹⁸

Under the Empire, youth was undoubtedly more extravagant than during the Republic. The Elder Seneca's criticism of the youth of his day was withering:

Look at our young men: they are lazy, their intellects asleep (*torpent ecce ingenia desidiosae iuventutis*); no one can stay awake to take pains over a single honest pursuit. Sleep, torpor and a perseverance in evil that is more shameful than either have seized hold of their minds. Libidinous delight in song and dance transfixes these effeminate. Braiding the hair, refining the voice till it is as caressing as a woman's, competing in bodily softness with women, beautifying themselves with filthy fineries—this is the pattern our youths set themselves (*nostrorum adulescentium specimen est*).⁹⁹

One can compare these young men with 'the followers of Bacchus and Venus' as described by the astrologer Manilius:

Beneath their influence devotees of Bacchus and Venus are born into the kindly light, and people whose insouciance runs free at feasts and banquets and who strive to provoke sweet mirth with biting wit. They will always take pains over personal adornment and an elegant appearance: they will set their locks in waves of curls or confine their tresses with bands, building them into a thick topknot, and they will transform the appearance of the head by adding hair to it; they will smooth their hairy limbs with the porous pumice, loathing their manhood and craving for sleekness of arm. They adopt feminine dress, footwear donned not for wear but for show, and an affected effeminate gait. They are ashamed of their sex; in their hearts dwells a senseless passion for display, and the boast of their malady, which they call a virtue. To give their love is never enough: they will also want their love to be seen (*semper amare parum est; cupient et amare videri*).¹⁰⁰

We meet such people in the provinces, too. Well known is the portrait drawn by the impassioned Christian author Tertullian of the dandies of his native Africa. Let us describe them in the words of L.B.Lawler: 'The young man we see, impelled by a most reprehensible desire to please, cutting his beard very short and plucking it out here and there; shaving around his mouth; carefully arranging his hair and smearing it down flat with ointments, or, if he has a grey hair or two, dyeing it; using powder; and then, worst of all, gazing anxiously at the result in that vanity of vanities, a mirror.'¹⁰¹

The behaviour of youth did not alter greatly in late antiquity. We have already mentioned the supporters of the Blues. Let us report here only one more testimony, from Gregory of Nazianzen, in which the Greek Church Father contrasts his adolescence with that of the average young man (*ἁ νεότητι μέμνηεν*). He was not interested in parties, foppish clothes or fancy hair-dos; he got no fun out of smutty talk or guffaws of laughter, while he was quite indifferent to sex; unlike many others, he showed no interest in either horses or hunting-hounds.¹⁰²

This rounds off our 'portraits' from different periods of Roman antiquity. There are various aspects of the young dandy's life-style which might be inspected, and which are discussed in another context: his passion for syrupy music and for the effeminate sports of the gymnasium, his favourite animals, his soft spot for female beauty, his sumptuous feasting. It is sufficient here to concentrate on his outward appearance, on his clothing, on the way he wore his hair and beard, on his manner of speech and his bearing.

The young Roman's appearance made him a subject of comment. Some young men—the pupils of certain philosophers—went about in rags, with unkempt beards and shaven heads (occasionally—not always—an expression of snobbery),¹⁰³ but as a rule young men wanted to be distinguished by a neat and colourful appearance. This fact emerges clearly from a comparison made by Quintilian between the clothes and style of an older and a younger person: 'It is the same with their style as with their clothes; purple and scarlet raiment goes ill with grey hairs. In the young, however, we can endure a rich and even, perhaps, a risky style [and apparel].'¹⁰⁴

In the area of fashion young people did not know when to stop. In his defence of his youthful friend Caelius, Cicero did not make a great fuss about the scandal his client had caused by the sort of purple (*purpurae genus*) he wore, by his sparkle (*splendor*), or his

brilliance (*nitor*); yet in another speech he fulminated against aristocratic youngsters who flaunted themselves in extravagant clothes, ill-befitting a Roman's dignity, not only in private but also in a busy city such as Naples.¹⁰⁵ Epictetus for his part rebuked a pupil on account of his fussy hair-do and over-dressy clothes. The young man excused himself by pointing out that many young people, 'on account of their youth (*ἐφ' ἡλικίας*) were tempted to offend in this respect.¹⁰⁶

At an earlier stage reference was made to unsuitable footwear.¹⁰⁷ In one of his sermons John Chrysostom condemned such ostentatious young people. Very soon they would be wearing women's shoes without feeling any sense of shame! The only things that concerned them were that the silk laces should be of the finest quality, that the colours should be sufficiently vivid and that the design should be well woven. Proud as a peacock, such a youngster minced his way across the marketplace. His only care was whether there was mud on the street in winter and dust in summer. The most troubling aspect of the whole business, in Chrysostom's opinion, was that parents looked on with resignation, that they did not get angry but considered this penchant for fashion as an innocent foible. A young man who decks himself out in this way is nonetheless uncouth in the way he treats the poor, is cocky and tries to attract everyone's attention by the ornaments he wears. He needs a lot of money for his striking shoes and clothes. If daddy is generous, darling son's prodigality knows no bounds. If daddy is stingy, then the son still uses every trick he knows to get money. Many youngsters virtually forgo their youth and let rich men pay them as buffoons or for various unbecoming services rendered.¹⁰⁸

What upset the Romans more than anything else was the effeminate way the young wore their clothes, the way they wore a *tunica* (an undergarment) with long sleeves, trailed their toga along the ground and sported garments made from see-through material.¹⁰⁹ Thus Seneca quite virulently condemned those 'who wear cloaks of outlandish colours, who wear transparent togas, and who never deign to do anything which will escape general notice; they endeavour to excite and attract men's attention, and they put up even with censure, provided that they can advertise themselves (*volunt vel reprehendi, dum conspici*).'¹¹⁰

Also, on account of their way of walking and talking, the dandies of the day were a subject for comment.¹¹¹ Those who sold luxury items did a brisk business thanks to shameless young customers

(*corrupta iuventus*),¹¹² who could not live without a mirror and doused themselves in expensive perfumes.¹¹³ Shaving all body-hair was also very common. This transpires from, for instance, Epictetus, who upbraided a young fellow as follows: 'When you have married, are you going to pluck out your hairs? ... Is this the kind of young man we ought to pray to have born and brought up for us?'¹¹⁴

The Roman dandy devoted a great deal of attention to the way he wore his hair and beard.¹¹⁵ Seneca could not bear the sight of youths 'who closely shear and shave the upper lip while preserving the rest of the hair and allowing it to grow', or of those dandies 'natty as to their beards and locks, fresh from the handbox' (*comptulos iuvenes, barba et coma nitidos, de capsula totos*) whose outward appearance was the mirror of their soul and whom no one could take seriously.¹¹⁶ They were not content to have their hair cut and combed in a simple style: they wanted it perfumed, wore it long—something common only for children and boy prostitutes¹¹⁷—or had it curled or layered. That care of their beards was not neglected is evident from the words of Seneca just quoted, as well as from the fact that Cicero, not without a trace of mockery, speaks of the *barbatuli iuvenes*, 'the youths with budding beards'.¹¹⁸

Pets¹¹⁹

Young men tried to attract attention by their appearance. It was their dream also to own dogs and horses. These animals were useful for sport and hunting, but soon they became 'status symbols' for young people. As early as Terence's day a happy father had this to say: 'As for the usual doings of young men (*quod plerique omnes faciunt adulescentuli*), such as interesting themselves in keeping horses or hounds, or in philosophical lectures, he didn't pick out one of these above the rest, but still he followed them all with moderation. I was delighted.'¹²⁰ It may seem odd that an interest in horses and dogs is mentioned here in the same breath as an interest in philosophy, but—as will be shown later on—philosophy too was all the rage among a considerable section of the youth.

The fact that the aforementioned animals were dearly loved emerges clearly from the fact that Catiline was able to win many youngsters to his side by generously conferring these animals upon them as gifts.¹²¹ In one of his letters the Younger Pliny wrote about a father who punished his son because he had spent too much

money on horses and dogs (*quod paulo sumptuosius equos et canes emeret*).¹²² These animals were popular with young men until the end of antiquity, when hawks too were in vogue, as Paulinus of Pella, for example, tells us of his own youth: ‘As my growth, so my waywardness increased, readily settling down to the pursuit of youthful desires (*iuvenalia vota*)—as to have a fine horse bedecked with special trappings, a tall groom, a swift hound, a shapely hawk, a tinselled ball, fresh brought from Rome, to serve me in my games of pitching, to wear the height of fashion, and to have each latest novelty perfumed with sweet-smelling myrrh of Araby.’¹²³

Horses and dogs (and hawks) were, of course, useful for hunting,¹²⁴ but an important aim of having them—especially horses—was probably to show them—and their owners—off. This fact is evident from Quintilian, who expressed detestation of the *delicati* who strutted through the streets with their horses and obliged them to trot in tiny steps.¹²⁵ Instructive, too, is the description which Juvenal gives of a young man who wasted all he had on horses and—although this was forbidden—galloped by day through the Via Flaminia—one of Rome’s busiest streets—so as to make a good impression on his girl-friend, who was wearing the *lacerna*—a common item of male apparel.¹²⁶

Revelling¹²⁷

Revelling—much like love, for example—was part of the ‘fun’ and ‘games’ of youth, the *iuvenalis iocus* or *ludus*.¹²⁸ Parents were often not unduly upset by the fact that their sons were living life to the full in an exuberant fashion. Terence, for instance, reports a father as saying: ‘It is no disgrace (*non flagitium est*) for a young man to patronize harlots or attend parties.’¹²⁹ In Ps.-Quintilian, we read of a young man who addressed the following words to his father:

What would you say if I were to live as a luxurious youngster (*delicatus adulescens*), like someone with an enormous amount of money, were I to live according to the morals appropriate to my age and fortune (*vel ex aetate mores vel ex fortuna*), were I to invite a crowd of my peers to indulge in sumptuous parties and nocturnal revelries, were I to live in a licentious and dissolute fashion and spend money right, left and centre... even though sensible fathers would simply attribute all these

things to their son's age (*quae tamen boni patres libenter annis remiserunt*)?¹³⁰

The youthful man-about-town turns up at every stage in Roman history. According to Polybius, as early as the first part of the second century BC most of the young people—those of rank, of course—were ‘degenerate’, and sumptuous parties and all the excesses that went with them were part and parcel of their lifestyle.¹³¹ Thus the comedies of Plautus and Terence were not so remote from current reality when they depicted youthful lovers revelling and feasting. Philolaches in Plautus’ *The Haunted House* is typical. Since his father was away on a journey, he did not let a day go by without revelling, living ‘in the Greek fashion’ (*pergraecari*) and renting the services of a series of lady-companions, zither-players, flautists, and prostitutes.¹³²

Young rakes certainly were more plentiful during the late Republic and the Empire. Cicero, for example, could not stand the dandies (*lauti iuvenes*), who hung about with the famous Clodia and were only happy at parties, where, under the influence of wine, they were witty, sarcastic and even eloquent. His voice is not devoid of mockery when he refers elsewhere to ‘the youths with budding beards’ (*barbatuli iuvenes*) or ‘the bottle conspirators’ (*comissatores coniurationis*), and when he describes how Catiline’s supporters, for a great part young people, conspire ‘reclining at their banquets, embracing harlots, stupid with wine, stuffed with food, crowned with wreaths, smothered by unguents, weakened by vice’.¹³³ Seneca for his part disliked youngsters who did not know when to stop drinking, who crowded out the kitchens of spendthrifts, who let no day go by without getting tipsy or creating some sort of spectacular scandal; he was violent in his disapproval of a vogue which caused a furore in his days (*frequens hoc adulescentium vitium*): young people got drunk in the baths before they had any food in their stomachs and considered waiting until after eating old-fashioned and insufficiently refined.¹³⁴ Then, in late antiquity, Libanius reacted against fathers who were not strict enough, who did not dare to administer punishment and were in fact afraid of their sons. The result was that the youngsters were their own masters, and that they did nothing but ‘sleep, snore, drink, get tight, and parade singing through the streets’. Their parents were at their beck and call, they actually encouraged their

amorous adventures and felt that in this way their darling boys proved their ‘virility’.

It would appear from the often rhetorically coloured sources that youngsters’ parties quickly degenerated into orgies. Yet it was not always the case, and sometimes parties provided the young with opportunities for reading their own poetry out loud, for joking, discussion—an articulation of youthful vitality and cheerfulness (*hilaritas iuvenilis*)¹³⁶ and of the desire for conviviality and sociability in the company of peers in their own world.

Money¹³⁷

Parties, sumptuous clothes, horses and dogs—obviously all these things could be, and were, expensive. The youngsters were unaware of the value of money; they were, so said Horace, ‘prodigal with money’.¹³⁸ The luxurious youth (*adulescens luxuriosus*) is a constant figure in comedy and in declamation exercises, yet fiction was never far from reality from c. 200 BC onwards. ‘Humane’ parents did not really mind that a young man should run through quite an amount of money, but it must have often occurred that their young darling went really too far. Thus Ps.-Sallust strikes a very negative note when he connects the dissipation of youth with revolutionary, even anarchic, tendencies; it is not, therefore, surprising that he asked the legislator to take measures to curb prodigality among the young. In his view, the leader of the state ‘ought to provide that young men may cultivate honesty and industry, not extravagance and the pursuit of wealth’.¹³⁹

It is odd that youngsters could manage to get money so easily in a society in which a father’s property (*patrimonium*) was so firmly protected by laws and customs. Theoretically a young man, as long as his father was still alive and unless he had been released from the *patria potestas* (which seems to have been uncommon), did not have any fortune other than—eventually—a *peculium*, a property (money, land, etc.) which the son could manage independently but which in theory remained his father’s property. Furthermore, an institution such as the guardianship (*cura*) saw to it that a young man should be protected against his own inexperience and flightiness in financial matters until he was 25.¹⁴⁰

Nonetheless, youngsters from a wealthy background could generally be sure of a generous supply of spending-money, so there was a considerable gap between theory and practice.¹⁴¹ There were

doubtless many parents who anxiously protected their fortune, but there must have been many too who kept their children supplied with money. Cicero was a typical example. His son Marcus saw to it that he had a good time while studying in Athens and was continually in need of money. The need was met by an ever-accommodating father, who wrote to his friend Atticus in the following terms: 'I appeal to you earnestly to see that he wants for nothing.... It is a point that concerns my duty and my reputation and dignity as well.... I beg you to be careful that we supply him with a reasonable and liberal income.... I will guarantee that neither Bibulus nor Acidinus nor Messalla, who I hear are at Athens, will spend more.'¹⁴²

Not every father was as obliging as Cicero. In cases where fathers proved difficult, the youngsters did not hesitate to use dishonest practices to trick them out of money. Ps.-Plutarch, for example, considered the theft of a father's money as one of the most common and serious excesses of which the young were guilty.¹⁴³ If he could not diddle dad, then a young man often ended up in the hands of usurers. The *Lex Plaetoria* of c. 200 BC¹⁴⁴ made it difficult for a youngster to borrow money. Nonetheless, many must have been regular customers of the money-lenders, since mention is made more than once of 'those who exploit the young', the *circumscriptores adulescentium*.¹⁴⁵ We have to mention in this context also the *senatusconsultum Macedonianum*.¹⁴⁶ It was called after a *filiusfamilias*, Macedo, who had killed his father to pay his money-lenders; it laid down that henceforth a person who lent money to a *filiusfamilias* could not sue for repayment even after the father's death.

A young man in need of money could steal from his father or borrow. Yet the ways by which money could be obtained did not end there. One way of securing a bit of extra pocket-money—or of losing it—was gambling. It goes without saying that adults were also offenders in this regard, despite the official ban, yet it was apparently the young who were really bitten by the games bug. Ps.-Plutarch viewed the game of dice as one of the most typical excesses of youth, and Juvenal claimed that the game of chance was one of the reasons why the circus held such an attraction for the young.¹⁴⁷

A less pretty sight was the young people who resorted to prostitution to get their hands on money,¹⁴⁸ who stooped to appearing as testament-hunters,¹⁴⁹ as informers of the courts (*quadruplicatores*),¹⁵⁰ gladiators¹⁵¹ or hooligans.¹⁵² Military service

also could be lucrative. From the time of the late Republic on, it was not popular with youth of rank, yet some were willing to serve the fatherland so as to earn a bit of money. Plutarch, for example, pointed out that many aristocratic youths followed Caesar so as to line their pockets and lead a life of debauchery.¹⁵³ Besides, there were always people in Rome who were prepared to give the young a helping hand, provided that they helped them to realize their plans. It might be a woman, such as Clodia,¹⁵⁴ or a politician, such as Catiline,¹⁵⁵ who relied heavily on the support from the younger generation. Thus Caesar also, who, to quote Suetonius, ‘was the sole and ever ready help of all who were in legal difficulties or in debt and of young spendthrifts (*prodigae iuventutis subsidium unicum ac promptissimum*), excepting only those whose burden of guilt or poverty was so heavy, or who were so given up to riotous living, that even he could not save them; and to these he declared in the plainest terms that what they needed was a civil war (*bello civili opus esse*)’.¹⁵⁶

VANDALISM¹⁵⁷

Youthful amusement degenerated easily into vandalism. We find a relevant example early on in Roman history (461 BC). Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus furnish a graphic description of what happened to a certain Lucius and his brother Volscius when, one night in the Subura—the ‘red light district’ of the city—they ran into a group of revelling and intoxicated youths (*iuventutem grassantem in Subura*). The ring-leader of the motley crew was Gaeso, as we have seen,¹⁵⁸ an important figure in the struggle between patricians and *plebs*. As Volscius was afterwards to relate, the young patricians held the ‘riff-raff’ of the streets in utter contempt: ‘At first they laughed at us and abused us, as young men when drunk and arrogant are apt to abuse the humble and the poor.’ A major quarrel was sparked off. Lucius was bold enough to stand up to the youngsters, yet the price he paid was high. The gang jumped on him and beat him senseless. When Volscius attempted to step in to help his brother, he met the same fate. In high spirits, Caeso and his friends moved on, as if they had performed a heroic deed, and left their victims for dead. More dead than alive, the two plebeians were carried home. Lucius, at least according to the plaintiffs in the case, died of the effects of his beating, while Volscius only pulled through with difficulty.¹⁵⁹

Acts of violence perpetrated by youths often occurred at night, frequently after a party. Once sufficiently inebriated, the young hot-heads set off in search of excitement. They worked off their pent-up aggression on innocent passers-by. Already in Plautus' day night prowlers appear to have made public thoroughfares unsafe; rowdy behaviour had become a feature of the 'customs of the youth (*iuventutis mores*)', and it was dangerous for an individual to venture out in the streets alone at night.¹⁶⁰ In Apuleius' day the situation had certainly not improved. Lucius, the leading figure of his novel *The Golden Ass*, was advised by his girl-friend Photis to return home early from a party because a mad crowd of well-born youngsters (*vesana factio nobilissimorum iuvenum*) threatened public order: 'You may see many murdered about in the streets, neither can the armies of the governor, for that they are afar off, rid the city of this great plague. And they will the sooner set upon you, by reason of your high station and for that they will disdain you being a foreigner.'¹⁶¹ In sixth-century Constantinople such gangs—in this case supporters of the Blues—were still behaving in a similar way:

They gathered in groups as soon as it became dark and would waylay men of the better classes both in the marketplace at large and in the alleys, robbing their victims of their clothing and their girdles and gold brooches and whatever besides they might have in their hands. And some they saw fit to kill as well as to rob, to keep them from carrying word to anyone of what had befallen them.... And as the evil continued and no attention was paid to the offenders by the city Government, the boldness of these men kept steadily rising to a great height.¹⁶²

Such hooligans generally wandered about in a group. From time to time, however, a young man acted as a lone perpetrator. A good example is to be found in Juvenal, who describes an encounter between an unfortunate and a young blood who was in pugnacious mood and could not sleep until he had roughed someone up, because 'some people are only rocked to sleep by a scuffle'. Though audacious on account of his youth (*improbus annis*) and intoxicated by wine, he still shied from attacking a wealthy man accompanied by a large retinue carrying torches. A poor passer-by, however, who made his way home by moonlight or with the help of a lamp, did not

scare him in the slightest and easily became his victim. The ruffian blocked his way and obliged him to hear: 'Where are you from?' shouts he; 'Whose vinegar, whose beans have blown you out? With what cobbler have you been munching cut leeks and boiled wether's chaps?— What, sirrah, no answer? Speak out, or take that upon your shins! Say, where is your stand [as a beggar]? In what prayer-shop [Jewish synagogue] shall I find you?' Whether the poor man attempted to answer back or to slip away, the end result was the same. The hooligan would attack equally viciously and would thereafter have the gall, in a reversal of roles, to summon his victim before the courts. 'Such is the liberty of the poor man: having been pounded and cuffed into a jelly, he begs and prays to be allowed to return home with a few teeth in his head!'¹⁶³

According to Suetonius and other sources, the 19-year-old Emperor Nero had the reputation of engaging in forays after dark. Alone or in the company of his friends—including Salvius Otho, five years his senior, and himself later emperor—he sallied forth at all sorts of pranks. He broke into shops and stole whatever he could lay his hands on. A canteen was set up in his palace, where he—the emperor!—auctioned off his booty. Married women were not safe from him, and he made sport out of attacking revellers returning home in the small hours. If they ventured to fight, they were brutally manhandled and thrown unceremoniously into the fetid waters of the public sewers. Defenceless or drunken unfortunates became acquainted with the *sagatio*, being tossed in a blanket.¹⁶⁴ The young emperor regularly got entangled in scuffles, and it goes without saying that he did not always escape unharmed. A certain medicinal plant, the *thapsia*, rejoiced in an exceptionally wide reputation early on during his reign because Nero used it with great success to make his face, battered and bruised during the nocturnal escapades, presentable again by morning. One night he received a thorough beating from a senator with whose wife he tried to interfere. Only after the incident did the senator discover whom he had beaten up. He was stupid enough to write to the emperor to beg pardon. Nero saw that he had been recognized and obliged the senator to commit suicide. From then on he saw to it that he was followed at a distance by soldiers and gladiators, who were ordered to speed to the rescue once they saw Nero could not master a situation single-handed.

Tacitus, as well as Dio Cassius, the Elder Pliny and Suetonius, informs us about the nightly adventures of Nero.¹⁶⁵ The

introduction to this anecdote, which we read in the last-named informant, is important: 'Although at first his acts of wantonness, lust, extravagance, avarice and cruelty were gradual and secret, and might be condoned as errors of youth (*iuvenilis error*), yet even then their nature was such that no one doubted that they were defects of his character and not due to his time of life (*naturae illa vitia, non aetatis esse*).'

According to this text, Nero was a case apart. Normally such pranks could be—and were—scribed to immature years, not to character. Nero's example was imitated by other 'bad' emperors: Caligula, Otho, Verus and Commodus sallied forth on nightly escapades before and/or after they had become emperor.¹⁶⁶ But, obviously enough, such sallies were not an imperial prerogative. That Nero's behaviour 'inspired' contemporary youth is evident from Tacitus. Once it was known that the emperor himself was a street-loafer, private bands of ruffians were formed who molested men and women of rank 'so that night-time conditions were like those in a city under enemy occupation'. The Pons Mulvius was at that time a busy nocturnal meeting-point. It was in this neighbourhood that some slaves of Nero's were assaulted by a band of youths whose debauchery at that time knew no limits (*per iuvenalem licentiam quae tunc passim exercebatur*).¹⁶⁷

The above are just a few examples of youthful violence, even vandalism. In this context we still have to discuss a passage from Augustine, where this Church Father describes his theft of some pears as a youth. In itself all that was involved was an innocent, juvenile prank. Yet the text is important because it affords an insight into what motivated a young man to his misbehaviour.

The young Augustine turned to misconduct 'in that notorious sixteenth year' when his parents were no longer able to finance his studies, so that just at the moment of puberty's rude awakening he settled into a period of idleness (*otium*).¹⁶⁸ Along with a group of friends—depraved youngsters (*nequissimi adolescentuli*), he calls them—Augustine broke into a neighbour's orchard in the middle of the night. Loaded with a substantial booty, they made good their escape. It was never their intention to eat the fruit—they had plenty of more succulent pears at home—and they threw them to the pigs.

What is at issue here was for Augustine a most serious crime. A normal criminal, he writes, has specific ends in view, which was not the case here. 'It was foul, and I loved it. I loved the self-destruction, I loved my fall, not the object for which I had fallen

but my fall itself.' With his friends he was driven only by a wanton pleasure in inflicting injury (*ex ludo et ioco nocendi aviditas*), by an unbridled passion for destruction; and they got pleasure from their deed quite simply because it was something forbidden and sinful (*non ob aliud, nisi quia non licebat*). At the same time they got a kick out of the idea that they had perpetrated a prank no one would ever have expected of them, and that no one would suffer gladly. The Church Father refers also to the role played by his friends in this incident, and to the influence of friends on youthful behaviour:

Yet had I been alone I would not have done it—I remember my state of mind to be thus at the time—alone I would never have done it. Therefore my love in that act was to be associated with the gang in whose company I did it.... Alone I would not have committed that crime, in which my pleasure lay not in what I was stealing but in the act of theft.... Friendship can be a dangerous enemy, a seduction of the mind lying beyond the reach of investigation. Out of a game and a jest came an avid desire to do injury and an appetite to inflict loss on someone else without any motive on my part of personal gain, and no pleasure in settling a score. As soon as the words are spoken 'Let us go and do it', one is ashamed not to be shameless (*et pudet non esse impudentem*).¹⁶⁹

This latest aspect has been nicely analysed by the same Augustine elsewhere. As a 16-year-old adolescent he contemptuously rejected the counsel of his mother, Monica, considered it mere woman's prattle and would have been ashamed to have given it a favourable hearing (*monitus muliebres, quibus obtemperare erubescerem*). He modelled his behaviour exclusively on that of his peers and allowed himself to be guided only by their scale of values. He yearned to be like them and to hold his own with them; he longed to be a member of the group at all costs, he wanted to be recognized as a fully-fledged equal by his friends, not to be considered a weakling, and his greatest fear was expulsion from their fraternity:

I went on my way headlong with such blindness, that among my peer-group I was ashamed not to be equally guilty of shameful behaviour when I heard them boasting of their sexual exploits (*iactantes flagitia sua*). Their pride was the more aggressive, the more debauched their acts were; they derived

pleasure not merely from the lust of the act but also from the admiration it evoked (*non solum libidine facti verum etiam laudis*). What is more worthy of censure than vice? Yet I went deeper into vice to avoid being despised, and when there was no act by admitting to which I could rival my depraved companions, I used to pretend I had done things I had not done at all, so that my innocence should not lead my companions to scorn my lack of courage, and lest my chastity be taken as a mark of inferiority (*ne viderer abiectior, quo eram innocentior, et ne vilior haberer, quo eram castior*). Such were the companions with whom I made my way through the streets of Babylon. With them I rolled in its dung as if rolling in spices and precious ointments.¹⁷⁰

PEER-GROUPS

From the foregoing it is clear that youths liked to group together spontaneously. In groups they practised sports, they made merry, they flocked through the streets of Rome, they committed hooliganism. To round off this chapter on the leisure activities of youth, I shall discuss some more structured peer-groups, the *collegia iuvenum* and the students' clubs.

The *collegia iuvenum*¹⁷¹

Classical antiquity had its formal youth movements. In ancient Greece one had the *ephebi* and—for the slightly older—the *neoi*.¹⁷² Ancient Rome had similar organizations, especially the *collegia iuvenum*.

Although they were not set up by Augustus, these fitted in well with his policies on youth.¹⁷³ Rome's first emperor reduced the minimum age for accession to the quaestorate and the senate (as well as to the office of judge) from 30 to 25,¹⁷⁴ he heightened the junior officer posts in the army and admitted senator's sons to the senate after reaching manhood;¹⁷⁵ he restored the temple of *Iuventas*, the goddess of youth¹⁷⁶ and reorganized the annual parade of the knights (*iuventus*) in the circus (the so-called *transvectio equitum*).¹⁷⁷ Furthermore, youngsters of the senatorial and equestrian classes who became impoverished through no fault of their own were helped financially,¹⁷⁸ special seats at the theatre were reserved for young aristocrats (the so-called

cuneus iuniorum),¹⁷⁹ the brothels could only open their doors after the young people had returned from their exercises in the *campus Martius*,¹⁸⁰ beardless youths (*inberbes*) were forbidden to take part in the Lupercalia and youngsters of both sexes were forbidden to take part at night in the secular games in 17 BC, unless they were accompanied by an older relative.¹⁸¹

It was doubtless Augustus' aim to 're-educate' youth along traditional lines, to reawaken their enthusiasm for military exercises, the sports in the Campus Martius, thus preparing them to play a 'useful' role in society. All this emerges clearly from the words which Dio Cassius some two hundred years later put in the mouth of Maecenas, Augustus' 'minister for culture':

With regard to the senators and the knights [it is my advice] that while they are still children they should attend the schools, and when they come out of childhood into youth they should turn their minds to horses and to arms, and have paid public teachers in each of these departments. In this way from their very boyhood they will have had both instruction and practice in all that they will themselves be required to do on reaching manhood, and will thus prove more serviceable to you [Augustus] for every undertaking.¹⁸²

Augustus was concerned for the moral, intellectual and physical integrity of youth. The *collegia iuvenum* possibly had their roots in the mists of history, yet the emperor probably revived these youth organizations and put his stamp on them. After Augustus' day, the *collegia* spread throughout the Western world. Their membership was made up, as can safely be assumed, especially— though not exclusively—of higher-class youngsters,¹⁸³ perhaps between about 15 (after taking the adult toga?) and 20.¹⁸⁴ The *collegia* often took the name of their city, although sometimes they were called after a district of the city, a deity, the emperor or the association's patron. They owned property, had their own magistrates and powerful protectors who made the funds they needed available, were controlled by the local authorities, usually enjoyed the favour of the imperial court and had their own festive celebrations, the *lusus iuvenales*.¹⁸⁵

The original intention may have been that these youth movements should provide the young with facilities for military training, and indeed this may have been the case in later times too in certain

districts, such as the frontier zones; yet the para- or pre-military character of the *collegia*, once stressed by especially M. Rostovtzeff,¹⁸⁶ probably was rather vague. Certainly after Augustus' day they normally served no military purpose. This is clear from the fact that, at least in Tusculum, there was a *collegium* for girls.¹⁸⁷ Certainly most *collegia* did ape the military somewhat, but, as M. Jaczynowska writes, 'all this preparation seems to have been only a "playing with weapons" rather than a service preparatory to army duty, as happened with the classic *ephebia*. P. Ginestet writes quite rightly in this connection: "But all this indicates a military form rather than a military action. One must not mistake parade-ground amateurs for soldiers".'¹⁸⁸

According to S. L. Mohler, the *iuvenes* received serious intellectual training,¹⁸⁹ but his opinion is most questionable. The *collegia* may have played an important role in local politics (for example in Pompeii); they took part in processions and official parades and certainly did have a religious role (oddly enough virtually never in the cult of *Iuventas*, but often in that of *Hercules*, the god of sport). As typical activities of the *iuvenes*—as of the *Hellenistic ephebi* and the *neoi*—we may also mention sport,¹⁹⁰ as well as mock fights in the arena, and hunting.¹⁹¹ Thus the *collegia* evolved into what H.-I. Marrou described as 'aristocratic and mundane clubs in which a gilded youth was initiated in society life and elegant sports'.¹⁹²

The *collegia iuvenum* illustrate how youth—or, rather, a section of the young—formed a closed community with its own established structures. It can only be regretted that the numerous inscriptions in which these organizations are mentioned provide us almost exclusively with information about the 'exterior' and tell us very little about the way in which the youths lived within their own 'city' or 'republic', as the *collegia* are called by C. Jullian and H.-I. Marrou respectively.¹⁹³ For the most part we are left to use our imagination to grasp the real life, the life lived, of the *iuvenes*. Perhaps J.-P. Morel may be right to complain: 'It remains a fact that these *collegia*, whose nature and functions have been so hotly debated, seem in the end to have played only a very secondary role in the Roman world. It is, in my opinion, an example of a subject that, considering its real importance, has excessively distracted the historians of Rome from researching more fundamental problems.'¹⁹⁴

Student life¹⁹⁵

It was above all, although not exclusively, in late antiquity that certain intellectual centres in the Graeco-Roman world developed into what, somewhat anachronistically, are often called 'universities'. In this section it is the intention to examine not students' 'curricula'—the main subjects were philosophy, law and, especially, rhetoric—but, rather, 'student life': students' recreation, their characteristic life-style, and above all the form it took away from the classroom.

Already during the late Republic a great number of Romans went off to the East, especially to Athens, to pursue studies.¹⁹⁶ Information from the early decades of the Principate is scarce, but when the second century AD wrought interest in eloquence and admiration for Greek culture to a new pitch, there came a fresh influx of young people from the West to Athens, as is shown by the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, which contain many delightful pictures of his (peaceful) student days at Athens.¹⁹⁷ The 'universities' of the day reached full expansion, then, in late antiquity, in the fourth and fifth centuries. The West was little represented now, but renowned 'professors' (*σοφισταί*) attracted students (*νέοι*) from the most remote parts of the East. Athens always remained the intellectual centre even when the city had completely vanished from the political map.¹⁹⁸ Other famous centres of study in the East were Rhodes (in the late Republic), Alexandria, Caesarea, Constantinople, Beirut (where a Latin law-school was very much in fashion) and Antioch (where Libanius lectured).¹⁹⁹ The foundation of the Athenaeum by the Emperor Hadrian can be considered as representing the founding of a cultural centre at Rome, which attracted students from the four corners of the known world, including the Greek world, and was an important centre of legal studies.²⁰⁰ Other important centres in the West were Carthage,²⁰¹ concerning which we have been supplied with information by Augustine, and—in earlier times—Marseilles, which during the first century AD was so fashionable that leading Romans preferred it to Athens, doubtless because residence there was quieter, cheaper and less of a danger to morals.²⁰²

Not all students were equally studious. Many were attracted above all by student life and enthusiastically plunged into all sorts of 'para-university' activity.

A student arriving at one of the intellectual centres of the day was very young, being anything from 15 upwards.²⁰³ Generally he attached himself to a master from his own region and joined his mentor's 'corps' (*χορός*) the sophist's bodyguard as it were. The members of the group were united in admiration for their professor, whom they considered the very best, the only good, teacher, and whom they were ready to defend through thick and thin. They tagged along wherever he went and even followed him when he took on a job in another city. The fact that they were often of the same nationality as their 'idol' only served to heighten their feeling of solidarity. There was a ringleader in the group, a student who, in addition to his intellectual properties, was endowed with a considerable amount of brawn and the necessary organizational skills.

For the sake of both the group's and the sophist's prestige it was necessary to have as many members as possible. Hence the constant hunt for new student members. Gregory of Nazianzen had this phenomenon in mind when referring to the 'sophists' mania' which had infected a large part of the student body at Athens (*σοφιστομανουσι τῶν νέων οἱ πλείστοι*) 'not only the ignoble and obscure youths but even the noble and illustrious':

They form a rather confused mass, at once young and difficult to restrain.... The students conduct themselves in respect to their masters and their masters' rivals [as crazy supporters in the circus], eagerly striving to increase their own numbers and thereby enrich them. The whole thing is quite senseless and insane. They seize upon cities, roads, harbours, mountain peaks, plains, frontiers; in fact, every part of Attica and the rest of Greece, and even most of their inhabitants. For they have divided these into factions by their rivalries.²⁰⁴

A watch was mounted, particularly in the harbours of the Piraeus and Sounion. Eunapius relates how, once a ship was sighted, the fanatical representatives of the various schools took their place on the quay-side. He also tells us how the ship in which he arrived in Athens moored under cover of darkness, 'before any of the usual proceedings (*τι τῶν εἰσθότων*) could take place'. The captain had probably chosen this hour of the night deliberately so as to mislead those on look-out duty. He delivered the entire consignment of students to the sophist Prohaeresius, with whom he had doubtless

reached an agreement. According once again to Eunapius, he delivered so many students that the newcomers seemed enough in themselves to man all the schools of the sophists, and ‘that at a time when battles were being fought to win only one or two pupils’.²⁰⁵

We get further information from Libanius about the shanghaiing of new students. As a lad in Antioch, he had heard all sorts of stories about student life in Athens:

From my boyhood I had heard tales of the fighting between the schools which took place in the heart of Athens: I had heard of the cudgels, the knives and stones they used and of the wounds they inflicted, of the resultant court actions, the pleas of the defence and the verdicts upon the guilty, and of all those deeds of daring-do which students perform to raise the prestige of their teachers. I used to think them noble in their hardihood and no less justified than those who took up arms for their country: I used to pray heaven that it should be my lot, too, to distinguish myself so, to go hotfoot to the Piraeus or Sounion or other ports to kidnap students at their landing, and then go off hot-foot once more to Corinth to stand trial for the kidnapping, give a string of parties, run through all that I had, and then look to someone to make me a loan.

The young man’s illusions were destroyed immediately upon his own arrival in Athens. Libanius fell into the hands of a sophists’ band. On the very next day he was abducted by another group. He was unable to catch so much as a glimpse of the sophist whose classes he had wished to attend. His guards incarcerated him in a cell no bigger than a barrel, let him scream his head off and kept him under lock and key until he swore fidelity to Diphantus and his disciples.²⁰⁶

From the moment the newcomers (*νεήλιδες*) arrived at the university they were subject to constant harassment.²⁰⁷ We have information on this pestering from Carthage. Augustine was a model student and he was proud of his academic achievements. As he writes himself, he kept his distance from the violent acts (*eversiones*) perpetrated by the *eversores*, the ‘Wreckers’ as they proudly called themselves, ‘a sinister and diabolical self-designation’ which in their eyes signified good breeding (*velut insigne urbanitatis*). ‘I lived among them shamelessly ashamed of not being

one of the gang. I kept company with them and sometimes delighted in their friendship, though I always held their actions in abhorrence. The Wreckers used wantonly to persecute shy and unknown freshmen. Their aim was to persecute them by mockery and so to feed their own malevolent amusement.' And the Church Father continues: 'Nothing more resembles the behaviour of devils than their manner of carrying on (*nihil est illo actu similius actibus daemoniorum*). So no truer name could be given them than the Wreckers.'²⁰⁸

Augustine was very negative about this teasing of freshmen, but Gregory of Nazianzen, another Father of the Church, spoke much more sympathetically about the custom. Once a young student, he tells us, found his way, willingly or unwillingly, into a *choros*, his reception involved his being subjected to 'this Attic custom, which is a mixture of the gay and the serious (*παιδιά σπουδῇ σύμμικτος*)'. He became a guest of one of the students, a friend, relative, compatriot or well-respected student, who kept him 'imprisoned'. Other students came to make fun of him:

Their purpose, I think, is to humble the pretensions of the newcomers and to bring them under their power from the start. The rallying is coarse or reasonable, depending upon the boorishness or the urbanity of the rallier. The practice, to those who are ignorant of it, seems fearful and brutal, but, to those who already know it, quite pleasant and charming, for there is more display than actuality in its threats.²⁰⁹

In a following phase, the newcomer was carried in solemn procession over the market to the public baths. In front of him and behind him other students marched in pairs. They stopped dead on arrival at the baths and then, in a frenzy, they began to rant, rave and jump about. 'At the same time they pound at the doors and frighten the youth with the uproar. Then they allow him to enter, and finally grant him his freedom, and on return from the bath receive him on equal terms with themselves (*ὡς αὐτῶν ἕνα*).²¹⁰ Only after having gone through this initiation was the youth allowed to wear the student's gown.²¹¹ The whole ceremony probably finished with a party provided at the expense of the newcomer.²¹²

Virtually no freshman escaped this initiation into student life.²¹³ Generally speaking, it passed off peacefully enough. But even when there were excesses, students were allowed a great deal, much more

than common citizens, and the civil power normally did not intervene.²¹⁴ Nonetheless, the customs at the law-schools of Beirut and Constantinople in Justinian's day seem occasionally to have got really out of hand. In the introduction to *The Digest* one can read how severe action would be taken against those who indulged in shameful behaviour at the expense of professors, fellow-students and, above all, freshmen: 'One can no longer consider behaviour which leads to crime as a "game" and we cannot tolerate it under any conditions.'²¹⁵

We can see here how the authorities took steps to put restraints on excessively riotous student conduct. There can be no doubt that similar action was taken elsewhere, and at earlier periods. An edict from the Emperor Valentinian, addressed to the city prefect and issued on 12 March AD 370, has survived. In it are laid down the formalities which have to be fulfilled by a student wishing to study in either Rome or Constantinople:

All persons who come to the City because of their desire for learning shall first of all upon arrival present to the master of tax assessment the requisite written documents from their several provincial judges, by whom the right to come to the City must be given. These documents shall contain the name of the municipality from which each student comes, together with his birth certificate and letters of recommendation certifying to his high attainments. In the second place, immediately upon matriculation the students shall indicate the profession for which they intend to study. In the third place, the office of tax assessment shall carefully investigate the life of the students at their lodging places, to see that they actually do bestow their time on the studies which they assert that they are pursuing.

These same officials of tax assessment shall warn the students that they shall severally conduct themselves in their assemblies as persons should who consider it their duty to avoid a disgraceful and scandalous reputation and bad associations, all of which We consider as the next worst thing to actual criminality. Nor shall the students attend shows too frequently nor commonly take part in unreasonable carousals. We furthermore grant to you as prefect the authority that, if any student in the City should fail to conduct himself as the dignity of a liberal education demands, he shall

be publicly flogged, immediately put on board of a boat, expelled from the City and returned home.

Of course, permission shall be granted for all students to remain at Rome till their twentieth year, if they industriously apply themselves to the work of their profession, but if after the expiration of this time any student should neglect to return home of his own accord, by the administrative action of the prefect he shall be returned even more disgracefully to his municipality.

In order that these provisions may not perhaps be perfunctorily enforced, Your Exalted Sincerity shall admonish the office of tax assessment that for each month he shall enroll on his register the students who come, whence they come, and those who must be sent back to Africa or to the other provinces according to the periods of time. Only those students shall be expected who are attached to the burdens of the guilds. Similar registers, moreover, shall be dispatched each year to the bureaus of Our Clemency, in order that We may learn of the merits and education of the various students and may judge whether they may ever be necessary to Us [for positions in the imperial service].²¹⁶

This edict fixes the upper age-limit on the period of study at 20. The emperor doubtless wished to react against students who unnecessarily prolonged their studies. Most students were the sons of *decuriones*, councillors in colonies and municipalities, in late antiquity people who exercised an unenviable profession. Perhaps H.W. Pleket is right when he sees this edict as an articulation of the coercive society of the period. In principle, he says, the students are needed at home to keep their native city back from the brink of bankruptcy by their political and financial contribution through their membership of the council of *decuriones*.²¹⁷ It was on account of this situation that they were sent back home while still relatively young. Besides, the fact that they were apparently not infrequently forced to return to their native town suggests that the students of the day who were drawn from the higher ranks of society were neither enthusiastic nor in any particular hurry to take up their civic responsibilities. Student days were too pleasant, municipal offices too heavy a burden, in those days.

It would transpire from the aforementioned edict that the recreational activities of students had sunk to a worrying level. This

fact emerges also from other testimonies. Eusebius sees it as remarkable that a certain Appian managed to preserve any morals during his studies in Beirut.²¹⁸ Libanius turned his fire upon pupils who squandered the money they received from their parents to pay their teachers in playing dice, orgies ‘and even worse things’. Before he himself set off for the university in Athens, his dreams centred on that type of activity, ‘to give a string of parties, run through all that I had, and then look to someone to make me a loan’. Once he got to Athens, however, few of his dreams were realized:

for I never so much as touched a ball all the time I was in Athens, and I kept myself well away from the carousals and the company of those who raided the houses in the meaner quarters at night, and I made it quite clear, too, that the singing girls—man-eaters, or neighbours perhaps more dangerous than Sirens—who have wrecked the career of many men, sang to me in vain.²¹⁹

Still other ancient authors inform us about this aspect of student life. Students newly arrived in their schools received a litany of advice from Himerius. He tried to restrain them from sauntering through the streets, and warned them against effeminate or dissolute habits, wanton parties, running about town, ballgames, and visiting the theatre and the gymnasium.²²⁰ According to Zacharias, the average student spent this time in gambling, courting loose-living women, getting drunk, frequenting the baths and attending the theatre, chariot-races and the hunting of wild beasts in the circus.²²¹

It is time to return to the activities of the ‘corps’. It has been seen how the students gathered round a professor and how the fiercest rivalry arose between the different groups. There was a permanent state of hostility between the schools. This fact emerges clearly from a passage in Libanius, cited earlier. While he himself was a student at Athens, precisely because he had been press-ganged into membership of a faction, he had kept his distance from the student fanaticism associated with these groups:

I took no part in the sallies, skirmishes, martial affrays, and parades. In fact, even on the occasion of the great riot, when everyone was involved, even those excused by their age, I alone stayed in my seat far away from it all, hearing of the

harm which befell each one and remaining aloof from the blows they dealt each other in their anger, giving none and receiving none, and with no intention of so doing, either.

Later, when he had become a professor, he dissuaded a father from sending his son to Athens on account of the street-fighting: 'It is soldiers they cheer on there, not rhetors.'²²²

Riots also occurred in other university towns. When Libanius describes students who indulged in unruly behaviour during his public lectures at Antioch, he accuses them of 'talking either about a past fight, or one that is being planned'. That the sophist himself did little to curb his students transpires from the accusation levelled by this teacher against his own students in the same speech—that they did not support him energetically enough: 'When it is necessary to defend their own teacher, it is even beautiful to transgress measure.' He recalled how he had once had students who venerated him as a father, who bore traces of the battles they had fought for him all over their bodies, on their heads, their faces, their hands. What a contrast with the lily-livered students he is now blessed with! Which of them has ever fought for him, courted danger or administered blows? Worse still: what word, what cry, what threat have they ever uttered, what dirty look have they ever given in his defence?²²³

The best example of a grim contest between rival schools is to be found in Eunapius. The tensions between citizens and students, and between students themselves, were so serious that the sophists deemed it necessary to give their lectures in their own homes. Two professors, the Spartan Apsines and the Cappadocian Julian, disputed power. A merciless fight broke out between the two parties in which the more reckless and robust accomplices of Apsines got the upper hand and roughed up their opponents in no uncertain fashion. Julian's disciples were at death's door. Yet the Spartans reversed the roles and brought the whole dispute before the courts as if *they* had been the victims. The proconsul had Julian arrested and put both himself and his students in irons. At the hearings Apsines too was present out of concern for his pupils and with a view to standing by them. The magistrate did not actually allow him to introduce the indictment. The floor was given to Themistocles, leader of the Spartan party—even though he was in fact an Athenian—and the chief rabble-rouser. He had no statement prepared, and was completely put out and tongue-tied. He and his rowdies had

only come along with a view to cheering on their teacher, Apsines, whenever necessary. Julian was not allowed to speak either. His pupil Prohaeresius was given the floor, and his speech was so brilliant and carried such conviction that even the proconsul stood up to applaud him. All the accused were acquitted, while Themistocles and his Spartans were given a sound thrashing.²²⁴

For every right-minded student it was a matter of honour to defend his professor through thick and thin and to make life as uncomfortable as possible for his rivals. The students did not direct their teasing and acts of violence against their contemporaries alone. The sophist from the opposite camp was not spared either. Sometimes the teasing took an innocent form, but sometimes not. Himerius, for example, was so seriously wounded by the pupils of a rival sophist that he could not give his lectures for a long time.²²⁵ While a teacher in Carthage, Augustine had to reckon with student misconduct. 'The licence of the students is foul and uncontrolled. They impudently break in and with almost mad behaviour disrupt the order which each teacher has established for his pupils' benefit. They commit many acts of vandalism with an astonishing mindlessness, which would be punished under the law were it not that custom protects them.'²²⁶

Libanius nearly managed to become a professor in Athens at the age of 25. Some sophists, who had all but lost their jobs thanks to the misbehaviour of their students, saw him as a serious rival and made life difficult for him. The talented youth was constantly ill at ease, never felt safe, and lived in perpetual fear of some student outrage being perpetrated against him. When he was invited as an older man to come and teach in Athens he declined: he had heard how a teacher from Arabia had been assaulted by two 'hirelings', who besmirched his face with mud, and how three Paphlagonians, who were second to none when it came to rudeness and shamelessness, dragged an Egyptian sophist out of his bed one night, carried him to a well and threatened to drown him unless he swore to quit the city: he was as good as his word and left for Macedonia, where he exercised another profession until his death.²²⁷

Student violence was not exclusively directed against rival students and their professors. There can be no doubt that ordinary citizens had to suffer it from time to time. Reference has already been made to Libanius in Athens, and to how he was exceptional in not taking part in nightly raids against poor people. When a professor in Antioch, he impressed upon his students how they ought

to live in peace with manual workers: it is an ignominy to curse a goldsmith, to insult a cobbler, to thrash a carpenter, to beat a weaver, to manhandle a shop-keeper, or to extort money from an oil-merchant. It was still worse when students ill-treated a pedagogue to whose charge students had been committed by their parents on account of their tender years (mostly between 15 and 20).²²⁸ Libanius has left a vivid description of how a bunch of students tossed such a man in a blanket. They caught a blanket by the corners and pulled it till it was taut, pushed their victim on to it, tossed him as high into the air as they could, and kept repeating this procedure, laughing at the anxious cries of the unfortunate, whose only good fortune was that he did not miss the blanket in landing, and they let him go only when he was a broken man and they themselves were exhausted. The entire city thought it absolutely disgraceful, and Libanius also felt constrained to give his students a severe dressing-down.²²⁹

It emerges clearly from what has been seen that students often had a fanatical admiration for their own professor. It goes without saying that not all pupils got on equally well with their teacher and that the latter often had to reckon with truculence, opposition and teasing from his own class.²³⁰ Quintilian, the famous educationalist of the first century AD, refers to the 'depraved' and 'bumptious' character of most pupils: *ingenio corruptus ac tumidus, ut plerique sunt*.²³¹ Where the misconduct of students in regard to their own teacher is concerned, Augustine is also informative. It has been seen how, as a student at Carthage, he distanced himself from the actions of the 'Wreckers' (*eversores*). When he was a teacher in the same city, dare-devil students made life impossible for him. This was the main reason why he moved from Carthage to Rome. He had learned that the students of the capital behaved much better, doubtless as a result of the disciplinary measures taken by the Emperor Valentinian in AD 370 and referred to above. In Rome no ravages (*eversiones*) were caused by young hooligans; nor did outsiders invade the class-rooms to create havoc. He became familiar with other abuses, however: 'To avoid paying the teacher his fee, numbers of young men would suddenly club together and transfer themselves to another tutor, breaking their word and out of love for money treating fairness as something to be flouted.'²³²

Libanius was forced to suffer similar behaviour. He complained bitterly about students who abandoned their professor and shifted loyalties to another. How unhappy the teacher felt at such

treachery! He got no taste from his food, he could not sleep at night, he mistrusted all his pupils. The student who had 'betrayed' him now behaved in an arrogant and shameless fashion and tried by word and deed to annoy his old teacher as much as possible. If the teacher asked for pay, the student replied that he had wasted his time with him, that he had learned nothing and really ought to have abandoned him much earlier. There were always apostasies of this type, Libanius continues, but never had they been so numerous. In the past, behaviour of this kind had been considered a perfect disgrace, but in his day it was a daily occurrence. Some pupils had done the rounds of all the schools until they were back at the school they originally abandoned. Sometimes there was a second, even a third round. Libanius launched a warm appeal for mutual understanding among professors, so that henceforward they should no longer take in turncoats. In this way discipline could be reintroduced in the student ranks. In fact, no teacher dared to take the bull by the horns, for fear that students might change camp.²³³

In other ways, too, the students did not make life easy for Libanius. In another speech he described the unmannerly behaviour of his pupils during a solemn lecture, a presentation to which a wider audience was admitted. He had ordered a slave to call the students in. They hardly budged, continuing to chat, laugh and sing the top hits of the day. Finally, they condescended to enter the hall, yet their lackadaisical attitude roused the ire of those already present and made them resentful. Finally the lecture could begin. The students, however, were winking at one another, were talking about this, that and the other, about charioteers, mimes, horses, pantomimes, and fights among students. Some students lolled about like statues, arms folded, while others picked their noses with both hands at once, remained utterly unmoved while everyone applauded, forced enthusiastic members of the audience to sit down. Their behaviour could be even more disgraceful: they clapped at unsuitable moments, prevented others from applauding, strutted ostentatiously through the lecture-theatre and tried to lure as many people as possible out of the hall by concocting false messages or by spreading round invitations to the baths.²³⁴

Many people had to suffer student misbehaviour. What was even more serious—and here again our source is Libanius—was that students could be hooligans dangerous to the state. Students were involved in a rebellion in Antioch in AD 387: they cut the strings of the lamps which illuminated the public baths and amused

themselves playing with the shattered statues of the emperors as if they were toys. At the same revolt they were guilty of arson. Once soldiers made their appearance, they fled *en masse* into the countryside, where they were able to enjoy their freedom to the full. They refused to return because the city was transformed into a garrison and bereft of all forms of amusement.²³⁵

For virtually everyone, for serious and less serious students alike, the years as a student were a glorious period recalled later with a certain melancholy, a period which had to end one fine day. When Valentinian laid down the rule that studies had to end once students reached 20,²³⁶ he was probably reacting against those who could not have too much of a good thing. Many studied well into their twenties, and, where legal studies were concerned, from the time of Diocletian to that of Justinian, they normally lasted until the age of 25.²³⁷

Saying goodbye to the student life was a painful moment, and was marked by moving scenes. Gregory of Nazianzen, who, together with his bosom friend Basil, studied in Athens, provides a vivid description of this parting:

The day of our departure was at hand, and with it all that is involved in departure: speeches of farewell²³⁸ and escort, salutations, laments, embraces, and tears. For there is nothing so painful to anyone as for those who have been fellow students at Athens to be separated from the city and from one another. Then, indeed, occurred a pitiable spectacle and one worthy to be recalled. About us were gathered our companions and classmates, as well as some of our masters, all crying out, in the midst of their entreaties, threats of violence and attempts at persuasion that, come what may, they would not let us go. They said and did everything natural to men in grief.²³⁹

In vain! Adieu to the student life, adieu to the easy life—the time had come to take up one's role in society.

IV

YOUTHFUL THINKING

In the foregoing chapters I dealt with youthful behaviour (leisure activities, the attitude towards the established order); in the next chapter the emotional life of youth will be discussed. Of course, acting, thinking and feeling constitute an indissoluble entity in human (especially youthful) life, but for reasons of surveyability we will discuss in this chapter the intellectual life of Roman youths, the way they experienced study, eloquence, philosophy and poetry.

THE WAY OF LEARNING

The educational system¹

So as to facilitate comprehension of the present chapter, it is essential first to provide an overview of the Roman educational system in which a distinction must be drawn between the original, traditional education, and education as it evolved under Greek influence from c. 200 BC onwards.

Initially education was largely a family matter. Until a child was about 7, it was principally the mother who looked after it. After that the father took over and saw to the physical, intellectual and moral education of his son. After being clothed with the adult toga—originally when aged 17, later between 14 and 16—the young man was entrusted by his father to a celebrated statesman or orator, under whose tutelage—usually for one year—he was initiated into public life (the so-called *tirocinium fori*). The text in which Plutarch describes the education which the Elder Cato and his wife gave their son gives a beautiful (although idealized) account of this kind of education based on practical experience:

After the birth of his son, no business could be so urgent, unless it had a public character, as to prevent him from being present when his wife bathed and swaddled the babe.... As soon as the boy showed signs of understanding,² his father took him under his own charge and taught him to read, although he had an accomplished slave, Chilo by name, who was a school-teacher, and taught many boys.... He was himself not only the boy's reading-teacher, but his tutor in law, and his athletic trainer, and he taught his son not merely to hurl the javelin and fight in armour and ride the horse, but also to box, to endure heat and cold, and to swim lustily through the eddies and billows of the Tiber. His *History of Rome*, as he tells us himself, he wrote out with his own hand and in large characters that his son might have in his own home an aid to acquaintance with his country's ancient traditions. He declares that his son's presence put him on his guard against indecencies of speech as much as that of the so-called Vestal Virgins, and that he never bathed with him.³

After Hellenism had overrun Rome, the traditional approach made way for the Greek system of education, and parents tended increasingly to hand over their offspring to 'specialists'. The process started with the Greek wet-nurse (*nutrix*) who breast-fed the child, fed him, cradled him to sleep, told fairy-stories, etc. From the age of 7 until he took the adult toga, a boy was entrusted to an also Greek tutor (*paedagogus*), who saw to the moral behaviour of his charge and supervised his studies. It was from 7 years onwards that intellectual training proper started. First there came 'primary instruction' (in higher social classes, always given at home) which provided the three Rs. Thereafter, between the ages of 11/12 and 15, the boy followed 'secondary school', which consisted largely of language and poetry taught by a grammarian (*grammaticus*). The highest level, until the age of 18/20, was given by the *rhetor*, whose main and only business was to teach the theory and—especially—the practice of eloquence.

The principal exercises were the *controversiae* and the *suasoriae*. *Suasoriae*—which were considered the easier of the two—were declamations where pupils 'advised' famous characters from history or mythology at some critical point in their career: for instance, 'Cicero deliberates whether he should beg Antony to spare his life'. In *controversiae* pupils spoke in the character of litigants—or their

advocates—in imaginary law-suits: for example, ‘The Vestal Virgin who wrote love poetry’. Such declamations were wildly popular, even when the ‘conservatives’ were all but enthusiastic. The judgement of somebody such as Tacitus was damning, although not totally fair:⁴

Nowadays our boys (*adulescentuli*) are escorted to the schools of the so-called ‘professors of rhetoric’, [those schools of shamelessness] of which it would be hard to say what is most prejudicial to their intellectual growth, the place itself, or their fellow-scholars, or the studies they pursue.... The exercises in which they engage largely defeat their own objects. You are of course aware that there are two kinds of subject-matter handled by these professors, the deliberative (*suasoriae*) and the disputatious (*controversiae*). Now while, as regards the former, it is entrusted to mere boys (*pueri*), as being obviously of less importance and not making such demands on the judgement, the more mature scholars (*robustiores*) are asked to deal with the latter—but, good heavens! what poor quality is shown in their themes, and how unnaturally they are made up! Then in addition to the subject-matter that is so remote from real life, there is the bombastic style in which it is presented. And so it comes that themes like these: ‘the reward of the king-killer’, or ‘the outraged maid’s alternatives’,⁵ or ‘a remedy for the plague’, or ‘the incestuous mother’, and all the other topics that are treated every day in the school but seldom or never in actual practice, are set forth in magniloquent phraseology; but when the speaker comes before a real tribunal [he is not able to say a word].⁶

Let me finish this section with some general remarks. It was broadly agreed that, besides grammar and rhetoric, there were five other liberal arts (*artes liberales*)—dialectic, arithmetic, music, geometry, astronomy—but only little attention was paid to them in the school of the *grammaticus* and the *rhetor*, while the educational value of music and athletics—so important in Greek education—was not (or almost not) seen by the Romans. There were also special schools for other disciplines, such as philosophy, law and medicine, and those who were unhappy with the schooling received in their native town (in a school or at home) could continue their studies in one or another intellectual centre in the East, where, as has been

seen, a typical student lifestyle blossomed. All schools were established as a result of private enterprise, and it was only under the Roman Empire (since Vespasian) that *some* teachers enjoyed some support from the state, mostly in the form of immunities from liturgies (duties to the state). It is important to note also that education in Rome at all levels (except in law) was originally given by Greek teachers in Greek and that it was only at the time of Augustus that a fully fledged education in Latin came into vogue; but even then Greek continued to enjoy for a long time (at least until the third century) a central position in the Roman educational system. The result was that many Romans of the late Republic and the early Empire were perfectly bilingual. The same cannot be said about the Greeks, who never ceased to despise the Romans as 'barbarians' and studied Latin only for self-interested motives, especially from the third century on, when Latin was the official language of the whole Empire, and a knowledge of it was useful for getting a job in the army, the law or the administration. But despite the difference in language, the aims and technique of education remained the same in the Latin- and Greek-speaking halves of the Empire, even in Christian times. Indeed, the Church did not make any significant attempt to create schools of its own; nor did the average educated Christian hesitate to let his children follow profane education.

The desire to study⁷

The reasons why a youngster should desire to study are obvious. The will to assert oneself was very important. From early on in Roman history education was crucial to self-advancement. It was a key to attaining an important position in society, especially under the Empire. This fact explains why subjects were studied which led to fame and status, and why eloquence took pride of place. For young men of good stock it was not difficult to succeed in society, but for a young man from lower down the social ladder it was much more difficult. Thus it was not unusual for an 'ordinary' youth to apply himself with particular industriousness to study, considering this as a way to overcome his social handicap.⁸

And yet there was more than just this motive. A young man mostly did not think exclusively in practical terms; he also longed for insight into himself and into the world; he often even enjoyed study for its own sake. It was Cicero's belief that man had a natural hunger for knowledge and that this inbred curiosity is perceptible

even in children, but that this longing for learning is at its strongest at a later age: 'Take persons who delight in the liberal arts and studies; do we not see them careless of health or business, patiently enduring any inconvenience when under the spell of learning and of science, and repaid for endless toil and trouble by the pleasure they derive from acquiring knowledge?'⁹

Doubtless Cicero is thinking especially of adolescence, the years of most intense development. As we shall see, his own youth illustrates the quoted words in an excellent way: he worked day and night, interested himself in all kinds of disciplines, did not take care of his health.¹⁰ Just as thirsty of knowledge was the 'philosopher' Apuleius, born in the African Madauros a few centuries later: 'From early youth on until today I studied eloquence, perhaps more intensely than anyone else, with contempt for all other pleasures, working day and night, giving all my energies, not caring about my health and getting ill.' He had inherited a sizeable fortune from his father. Studies cost a lot—one has only to think of books, school-money, staff (tutors, slaves), renting accommodation, costs involved in travel, etc. Apuleius had spent longer than was usual studying at Athens and travelled a lot. He had given considerable financial assistance to his friends and was always generous to his teachers. He had willingly made these financial sacrifices, and, as he says himself, 'I would not have hesitated to spend my whole patrimony to obtain what seemed to me more important.'¹¹

Another typical example crops up again a few centuries later in the young Libanius, born in Antioch. He relates in his autobiography how, as a child, he had never been much interested in study and had spent more time wandering round the countryside than at school. Suddenly, at the age of 15, a love for literature took him by storm. Children's games held no charms for him any more. Even the gladiator games, the horse-races, the theatre—none of these could distract him from his books.¹²

A student from a wealthy background could easily afford to pay for his studies (or to have them paid for). Less well-to-do students, such as Horace and Augustine, were also able to follow a course of advanced studies because their parents scrimped and saved, because they were supported by a patron and because they could reckon on the goodwill of a teacher who was willing to forgo a fee.¹³ A remarkable example of a young man who, despite dire poverty, still made a success of his studies, was Prohaeresius, who went on to become an excellent sophist. His youth is an example of daring and

the spirit of initiative, but also of the hunger for knowledge. He was an Armenian, but came to Antioch when still a young man and attended the lectures of Ulpian, the best teacher of the city. Like many others, he too dreamed of spending some time in Athens. He set off for Greece with his friend Hephaestion. Both were equally poor; between them they possessed one threadbare cloak and mantle, and four old, shabby blankets which yielded little warmth. The only option left to them was that they should fuse to become one person. While one appeared in public and attended lectures, his bosom pal remained at home to study under the blankets.¹⁴

Young Cicero, Apuleius, Libanius, Prohaeresius: it is evident that they—and many others in many countries—fully endorse the words of Seneca that youth is the time *par excellence* for learning¹⁵ and fulfil the following words of Galen who is certainly thinking about his own youth: ‘As soon as a youngster reaches adolescence (*ἐπειδὴν γένηται μενράκιον*) he must have a frenzied enthusiasm for the truth, like one possessed; neither by day nor by night must he cease striving to master all that has been said by the most famous of the Ancients.’¹⁶ The moment mentioned by Galen for the beginning of this yearning to learn is not an arbitrary one: it has to do with the awakening of logical thinking at puberty.¹⁷

Enthusiasm for study is also evident from the fact that, unsatisfied by the teaching received at school, some youths showered a learned person with questions or took interest in ‘scientific’ discussions. A remarkable example of the first kind was Dioscorus, a young Greek who studied at Rome, as happened more in the fourth century AD. Before leaving home, he wrote a letter to Augustine asking for an explanation for an endless series of problems (*innumerabilium quaestionum turba*) concerning Cicero. His letter has been preserved: it is apparently written in a hurry, is not always logical, and sounds arrogant and pathetic. The youth also confesses why he is asking all these questions: ‘You know people, how they are fond of criticizing, you know how somebody who doesn’t know how to answer a question is considered illiterate and stupid (*indoctus et hebes*).’¹⁸

The youthful interest in more-or-less scientific discussions is apparent from several works of Cicero, Plutarch, Macrobius and Augustine.¹⁹ Particularly instructive in this regard is Aulus Gellius’ *Attic Nights*, written about 150 AD. In this encyclopaedic work frequent mention is made of the fact that the Roman students at Athens regularly got together, with or without their teacher, to have

discussions. The philosopher Taurus, for example, regularly invited his best students for a pleasant—and useful—get-together. So as not to arrive empty-handed, each student came prepared with a number of subtle questions (*argutias quaestionum*). Once the meal was over, questions were posed ‘by way of a dessert’. The subjects raised, Aulus Gellius tells us, were not weighty but rather delicate and frivolous, in keeping with the slight inebriation the wine had induced in their spirits. For example, they speculated on the question of at what stage a pupil could be considered to be an artist: while still a student or only when he had become an accomplished artist.²⁰

A similar type of students’ gathering is described by the same author. Roman students at Athens visited one another during the Saturnalia, a sort of Roman carnival time. They spent these days ‘very merrily yet temperately, not “relaxing their minds”, as the saying is...but diverting their minds a little and relieving them by the delights of pleasant and improving conversation.’ The pupil whose turn it was to throw the party drew up a list of as many topics for discussion as there were guests. One teased out such questions as the precise meaning of an obscure or subtle thought in an ancient poet, the interpretation of some event in ancient history, the solution of a sophism, the meaning of an antiquated or arcane word. The reward offered by the host to the guest who solved an intellectual teaser could be a work by an ancient Greek or Latin author, and a garland of laurels.²¹

Hard study and intellectual discussion: it illustrates the longing for knowledge which characterized some (though, of course, not all!) young men. Typical in this area is also the fact that some were obsessed by a real hunger for reading. Such young men were the future emperors Marcus Aurelius and Julian,²² but suffice it to mention here only the young Augustine. As we shall see, after the death of his bosom friend, he became a member of what one could call a reading group.²³ In another context also he describes himself as an extremely eager and bookish youth:

What advantage came to me from the fact that I had by myself read and understood all the books I could get hold of on the arts which they call liberal?... What profit, then, was it for me at that time that my agile mind found no difficulty in these subjects, and that without assistance of a human teacher I could elucidate extremely complicated books?²⁴

Topics of interest²⁵

As we shall see below, the main interests of youth focused on poetry, philosophy and—above all—eloquence. Nonetheless young men in antiquity were liable to interest themselves in virtually anything. In the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius we regularly encounter youngsters who enthusiastically concerned themselves with problems and intellectual subtleties from rhetoric, poetry, history, medicine, astronomy, astrology, physics, dialectic or grammar. Typical also were the young Augustine (cf. the text just quoted) and, centuries earlier, Cicero, who wrote concerning his own youth that he studied in those days ‘day and night all possible disciplines (*hoc tempore omni noctes et dies in omnium doctrinarum meditatione versabar*)’.²⁶

It would be an exaggeration to state that natural sciences²⁷ fascinated the young. Nonetheless, there were some youngsters who devoted themselves to them, motivated in Plutarch’s view by ‘frivolity and ambition (ὕπὸ κουφότητος καὶ φιλοτιμίας)’²⁸. Mathematics²⁹ too was not a subject that normally was very popular, yet Plutarch, who in his youth was particularly (ἐμπαθῶς) interested himself in the subject,³⁰ relates how certain students lost no opportunity to show off their mathematical (and dialectical) skills. It was their custom to pester their teachers with questions which were too clever by half, such as the splitting of the infinite. They particularly enjoyed getting the teacher on to unfamiliar territory, terrorized a philosopher with questions about physics or mathematics, bombarded physicists with hypothetical propositions (for example: if Plato walks, Plato moves; if it is daytime, the sun is in the sky) or the sophism of the liar (if someone tells a lie and says that he is lying, is he then, in fact a liar?).³¹

Given the contempt in which ‘paid’ professions were held, medicine³² held few charms for the upper-class youngster, in the Western World still fewer than in the East. The backbone of medical studies throughout antiquity was the practical, often rather short, apprenticeship, but there were people who tried to place the study upon a scientific basis. It was Galen’s opinion that medicine was ‘the most noble and divine of arts’ and the one for which the young ought to have a natural preference.³³ If what this Greek physician and scholar writes is to be taken at face-value, as a youth he himself felt a real vocation for science. While still very young (εὐθύς ἐκ μαιρακίου) he learned to despise the received wisdom and to engage in a single-minded pursuit of the truth. At 14 he

attended the classes of various philosophers— Stoics, Peripatetics, Academics and Epicureans—without wishing to commit himself to one particular system. Otherwise, he does not appear to have been an easy pupil, for, on his own admission, even as a lad he held a number of teachers in contempt on account of their ignorance, while others were kept on their toes by his contradictory remarks. At the instigation of his father, who was himself interested in several sciences, from the age of 17 onwards on he combined philosophy and medicine. His capacity for work was inexhaustible: he worked day and night, and ‘devoured’ all possible books on philosophy and medicine, until he became sick as the result of all his effort. He studied medicine for at least eleven years, and while still a student he wrote one or two medical tracts. At that stage also, he did not confine himself to any particular teacher or school. He commenced his studies in his native city, Pergamum, and went on to study in the important medical centres of Smyrna, Corinth and Alexandria. At the age of 28 he became resident doctor in the gladiator school of Pergamum, but for a great part of his successful and productive career he stayed at Rome, where he became the court-physician of Marcus Aurelius.³⁴

In the Western World, grammar, history and law enjoyed far greater standing than the sciences thus far mentioned. They thus were more popular, especially because they were useful for an *orator* or *rhetor*. History³⁵ was studied at school only casually, but the interest a young man was capable of showing in this discipline is illustrated by a reminiscence of his youth told by Pliny in one of his letters. When Mount Vesuvius erupted in AD 79, everyone panicked. The 18-year-old lad, however, remained completely calm, a fact which Pliny attributes to his firmness already at that age, or due to the rashness typical of youth. A friend came storming into his room and got angry at his serenity, but the young man asked to be given a book of Livy’s and, completely unruffled, began to read and to write down citations.³⁶

It may seem odd that grammar too, normally studied with the grammarian between the ages 11/12 and 15, could be a source of fascination to some young people, even at a more advanced age. When, in 168 BC, Crates of Mallos introduced grammar to Rome, there can be no doubt that his success³⁷ was primarily with the young. Generally speaking, this discipline was at the service of poetry and eloquence, yet during the second century AD many were interested in it for its own sake. Aulus Gellius’ work swarms with

youngsters who were ‘crazy’ about grammar. Extra spice was added to parties such as those described above by grammatical teasers: which author used *verant* in the sense of *vera dicant*? Does the form *scripserim* suggest past or future tense?³⁸ Not all teachers were able to come up with the right answer. At one particular party an otherwise renowned grammarian was royally indignant to discover the poet Caecilius using *frons* in the masculine gender. ‘What a solecism!’, he exclaims. The young Gellius became angry, ‘as it was permitted by his age’ (*ut tum ferebat irritatio aetas*), and riposted that this was *not* the case. He quoted a grammatical rule which stated that the word in question had to be masculine. The pseudo-teacher answered with disdain, saying that one could quote any number of exceptions. ‘What are they?’ cried the youngsters present in unison, and Gellius sent off the worthless fellow with the words: ‘Go now and take thirty days to hunt one up; when you have found it, meet us again.’³⁹

Highly esteemed in the Roman world was the study of law.⁴⁰ Originally a familiarity with this discipline was acquired through practical experience gained by apprenticeship to a famous lawyer—as, for example, was the case with Cicero⁴¹—or by attending actual trials in the forum. After Cicero’s day this practical training was supplemented by a theoretical education, yet it was only in the first century AD that law schools as such came into existence.

In the schools of the grammarian and particularly of the *rhetor* students were superficially introduced to the law, but oddly enough it was not expected that an attorney should be a specialist in the law. These studies were undertaken mainly by those who wished to make an—often lucrative⁴²—profession of the law and earn their daily bread from it, a group who in the opinion of a rhetorician such as Quintilian was either failed orators or loafers, simple-minded souls or wretches who did not know what else to do with themselves.⁴³ Some centuries later the sophist Libanius shared this opinion.⁴⁴ Of course such words were inspired by professional jealousy. Rhetoric as a preparation for a successful civic life was confronted in late antiquity by growing competition, and for a sophist it must have been an unpleasant experience to see how students fled to the Latin law-school of Beirut⁴⁵ and how ships left the East filled with youths who wanted to study law and Latin at Rome.⁴⁶ Those skills were in these days most useful for someone who wished to obtain a post in the army or the ever-growing imperial administration, an appointment which usually was not very attractive but it at least made

life endurable.⁴⁷ The same can be said about stenography:⁴⁸ it also was very popular with youth in late antiquity, and for that reason detested by the same Libanius.⁴⁹

It was, of course, not only in school that knowledge was acquired. Travel⁵⁰ broadens the mind, and in antiquity too many youngsters travelled in the pursuit of knowledge. According to Philostratus, who put these words into Apollonius of Tyana's mouth, 'it was a young man's duty to go abroad and to embark upon foreign travel'.⁵¹ There were doubtless many youths like Apuleius who had the itch to travel (*viae cupidus*).⁵² Lucian, for instance, relates how a young man who was studying in Alexandria went missing for a long time and then suddenly turned up after a journey which had taken him up the Nile and as far away as India.⁵³

Historical sites also had a strong appeal. In Cicero's *On the Definition of Good and Evil*, Piso asks the young Lucius Cicero whether or not he enjoyed his visit to the agora in Athens. Blushing—as befitted a respectable youth—the lad answered: 'I have actually made a pilgrimage down to the Bay of Phalerum, where they say Demosthenes used to practise declaiming on the beach, to learn to pitch his voice so as to overcome an uproar. Also only just now I turned off the road a little way on the right, to visit the tomb of Pericles. Though in fact there is no end to it in this city; wherever we go we tread historic ground.'⁵⁴

In the second century AD, the archaic period, interest in the past seems to have been extremely strong. Impressions of travel from the pen of the 23-year-old Marcus Aurelius give us a good idea of 'youth tourism' in those days:

Before reaching our country house we turned aside to Anagnia, about a mile off the main road. Then we inspected that ancient township, a tiny place, indeed, but containing many antiquities and buildings, and religious ceremonies beyond number. There was not a corner without its chapel or shrine or temple. Many books too, written on linen, and this has a religious significance. Then on the gate, as we came out, we found an inscription twice over to this effect: *Flamen sume samentum* [Priest, don the fell]. I asked some of the townsfolk what the last word meant. They said it was Hernican for the pelt of the victim, which the priest draws over his peaked cap on entering the city. Quite a number of other things we learned which we were glad to know.⁵⁵

ELOQUENCE⁵⁶

During the whole of Greek and Roman antiquity eloquence was regarded as the pinnacle of human achievement. It was the talent which distinguished men from animals, and Greeks or Romans from 'barbarians'. Even when, as was the case under the Empire, its practical usefulness was greatly reduced, the prestige conferred by eloquence remained virtually undiminished. In this section the role which the young played in the development of eloquence, the efforts they were prepared to make to master the skill and the factors which made it so attractive to them will be investigated, as well as the appearance of youth in the school of the *rhetor*—their appearance in the forum having been discussed already—and the style typical of youth.

Youth and the development of eloquence⁵⁷

The traditional eloquence which was self-taught, acquired through the practice of the art, faced stiff competition already at an early stage. After the second Punic War, c. 200 BC, Rome was inundated with Greek teachers of all sorts who had marked success with youth, despite the fact that the conservative Romans were opposed to the theoretical and 'impractical' training that they gave and banished rhetoricians (as well as philosophers) more than once from the capital.⁵⁸

As from about 150 BC Greek teachers were very common in Rome. The year 92 BC marked an important turning-point. L. Plotius Gallus attempted to Latinize rhetorical training, which up to then had been an exclusive monopoly of the Greeks. The conservative Romans once again would not hear of this novelty (*novum genus disciplinae; haec nova*) and the censors expelled the *rhetores latini*, who were idolized by the Roman youth (*ibi homines adulescentulos dies totos desiderare*).⁵⁹

In Cicero's *On the Orator*, the censor L. Licinius Crassus defends his decision. The Greek schools were far from being perfect, and yet their defects paled into insignificance when compared with those of the Latin teachers. Regardless of what others may have claimed, Crassus said he had no objections to providing the young with an opportunity to sharpen their intellects. What he found intolerable was that at school they should be dulled into passivity, that they should forget what they had already learned rather than learn

something new. Moreover, in his view, these schools were schools of iniquity (*ludus impudentiae*) since the only thing the Latin teachers taught was bravado (*audere*), something that ought to be avoided at all costs.⁶⁰

It remains an open question whether Crassus gave his real reason for banning the *rhetoires*. He certainly reacted against the 'impractical' character of the training and against the fact that the pupils were all too keen to use flowery language on subjects which had no direct connection with the daily realities of Roman life. The principal—unmentioned—objection, however, seems to have been of a political nature. The conservative *optimates* were opposed to making higher education less exclusive. Classes given in the vernacular would enable ordinary people to attend school and thus eventually enter a successful political career.⁶¹

Crassus' edict against the *rhetoires* was a dead letter from the word go. A short time later (c. 85 BC), a theoretical work on the subject of eloquence, the *Rhetoric to Herennius*, written most probably by a young man who was greatly influenced by the Latin *rhetoires*, was published.⁶² Being very young,⁶³ Cicero himself wrote his *On Invention* about the same time. With this and his later rhetorical works he laid down the basis for a Latin rhetoric, and from the time of Augustus onwards the level of the Latin rhetorical schools matched the Greek ones.

The way of eloquence practised during the Empire was very different from that of the Republican period and was not inconsiderably affected by the change of political system. Freedom was curtailed; the Romans were well and truly gagged. Political eloquence was virtually non-existent, and the number of genuinely stirring court-cases was greatly diminished. In the competition between the eloquence of the forum and the rhetoric of the schools the latter won the upper hand.

Right up until the close of antiquity the schools of rhetoric continued to fascinate students. From the end of the first century AD, in addition to (or in the place of) the *rhetor*, there appeared on the stage the sophist, that wizard of language who, as centuries earlier in the time of Plato, travelled from town to town to demonstrate his art. This second ascendancy of the sophists⁶⁴ was largely a Greek affair, yet Greek sophists regularly appeared in Rome, where they registered remarkable success, probably especially with the young. Thus the sophist Scopelian of Clazomenae often visited Rome as a (successful) ambassador. An oration on one

occasion was so fantastic ‘that a brilliant band of youths (*νεότης λαμπρά*) fell in love with his genius and followed him to Ionia’.⁶⁵

A youth memory of Lucian illustrates the attractions of sophistry for youth in a striking way. As a child Lucian had developed a considerable skill in shaping clay figurines. As he grew up—doubtless towards the beginning of puberty—the family council decided to entrust him to his uncle so that he could be apprenticed to a sculptor; in that way he would soon earn some money and no longer be dependent on his family for support, which would not be the case were he to pursue further studies. One day young Lucian had a dream in which, as had happened with Heracles,⁶⁶ two women appeared before him: one, in splendid apparel, was Education; the other, dressed like a frump, was Sculpture. Education—actually eloquence—depicted for Lucian the triumphs he would have thanks to her art, even though he was of humble background. The young Lucian did not hesitate long and opted firmly for the call of Eloquence.⁶⁷

This testimony is remarkable because it gives us a rather exceptional insight into lower-class childhood. It certainly was difficult for a low-born youth to climb up the social ladder, but the example of Lucian illustrates that it was possible. Hence his call to young men of humble descent to follow in his footsteps:

I told this dream in order that those who are young may take the better direction and cleave to education, above all if poverty is making any one of them faint-hearted and inclining him toward the worse, to the detriment of a noble nature. He will be strengthened, I am very sure, by hearing the tale, if he takes me as an adequate example, reflecting what I was when I aspired to all that is finest and set my heart on education, showing no weakness in the face of poverty at that time, and what I am now, on my return to you—if nothing more, at least quite as highly thought of as any sculptor.⁶⁸

Theory and practice⁶⁹

As has been said already, in earlier times the art of eloquence was learned largely through practising it. Nor did this important form of apprenticeship disappear once the schools were established. On their own initiative youngsters became disciples of famous orators:

under the Republic youth idolized such figures as Cato the Censor, Hortensius or Cicero,⁷⁰ and under the Empire too they had their 'heroes'. In Tacitus we read how orators enjoyed great prestige with the worldly youth (*apud iuvenes vacuos et adulescentis*),⁷¹ and Quintilian relates how talented lawyers were watched with an eagle eye by the 'exemplary' youth of his day (*iuvenes ad optima tendentes*).⁷² Tacitus himself provided the young Pliny with a model to be imitated, even if he was only five years his senior.⁷³ Pliny, too, had a large 'fan-club'. In one of his letters he writes how one of his fans hung on every word of one of his pleas; even though his clothes were torn to ribbons in the stampede of the throng, yet this young man still stood for seven hours, covered by nothing but a toga, listening with bated breath.⁷⁴

The combination of a practical and a theoretical training is best illustrated by Cicero's youth.⁷⁵ The orators of the day were Mark Antony, the grandfather of the *triumvir*, and Licinius Crassus, who banished the *rhetoires latini*, as has been seen. They had spread the myth that their eloquence owed nothing to theoretical studies. That was the reason why many people of his entourage said that Cicero, then about 14 years old, was crazy to make such strenuous efforts to master the theory of eloquence. The lad was not easily put off and tried to convince his acquaintances with complimentary statements by members of his family, a typically childish tactic. He himself visited Crassus at home several times and thus was able to observe clearly that, 'in so far as he as a child could judge such matters (*quod vel pueri sentire poteramus*)', all those rumours were pure concoctions. Antony, for his part, often told him about the learned discussions he had in Athens and on Rhodes. So Cicero summoned up all his courage and put a lot of questions to the great man concerning eloquence 'in so far as the diffidence of his youth (*ineuntis aetatis pudor*) permitted'.⁷⁶

Cicero's formal training in rhetoric began when, at the age of 15, he put on the adult toga. Like so many young men, he felt attracted in those days by the *rhetoires latini* but was dissuaded from entrusting himself to them by the advice of 'very wise men' (probably Antony and Crassus).⁷⁷

There is a lengthy account of the training he received in his *Brutus*.⁷⁸ The young Cicero was 'obsessed by eloquence' (*cupidissimus audiendi*) day in, day out, although the practice of eloquence in those turbulent days was restricted. Celebrated orators such as Hortensius, Mark Antony and Cotta were absent

from Rome or even exiled. Cicero tried, however, to attend virtually every public meeting and nearly all court-cases held in the forum. He did not confine himself to practical training, however, 'but read and declaimed daily with unflagging interest (*acerrimo studio*), not being satisfied to confine himself only to rhetorical exercises'. In those days he developed an interest in poetry and translated Greek tragedies into Latin so as to develop linguistic facility.⁷⁹ After he had taken the adult toga, his father entrusted him to the lawyer Scaevola, on whose every word he hung.⁸⁰ He was also profoundly influenced by L. Aelius Stilo, an 'all-round' scholar who numbered Varro among his pupils, while the academic philosopher Philon of Larissa made such a deep impression upon him that he for a moment toyed with the idea of abandoning eloquence for philosophy.⁸² He was also intimately acquainted with the Stoic Diodotus, who first introduced him to the art of dialectic, in Cicero's eyes a condensed form of eloquence.⁸³

Not without cause, Cicero wrote that in this period he worked day and night at the acquisition of all possible intellectual skills: *at vero ego hoc tempore omni noctes et dies in omnium doctrinarum meditatione versabar*.⁸⁴ He never lost sight of his true goal, however: all other disciplines helped towards the attainment of his greatest ideal, eloquence. Daily declamation—mostly in Greek, but often also in Latin—provided the most immediate preparation.⁸⁵

In the year 82 BC, the political situation became somewhat clearer. Later than was usually the case, the 24-year-old Cicero began his career as an orator. 'At that time I first began to undertake cases both civil and criminal, for it was my ambition, not (as most do) to learn my trade in the forum, but so far as possible to enter the forum already trained.'⁸⁶ The *Pro Roscio Amerino*, the case which made his name, has already been discussed.⁸⁷ There were many other cases which he brought into court, 'carefully worked out and...smelling somewhat of the midnight oil',⁸⁸ yet except for his actual début with the *Pro Quinctio* none of them has been preserved.⁸⁹

At this period, Cicero suffered from ill health. All his studying and the effort required made intense demands on him. Friends and doctors alike advised him to give up appearing in court. However, he would not listen to such a suggestion, 'but resolved to run any risk rather than abandon his ambition for oratorical renown'.⁹⁰ Although Plutarch claimed that it was because his plea on behalf of Roscius had made it too hot for him to stay on in Rome,⁹¹ it was

officially for medical reasons that Cicero undertook a long-term study-trip to Greece in 79 BC. He stayed in Athens for six months where he studied philosophy and eloquence. Afterwards, in the company of the most celebrated orators, he made a trip through Asia Minor, ending up in Rhodes to visit the rhetorician Molo, whom he had already heard on a few occasions in Rome, and who repressed the youthful excesses of his style (*iuvenilis licentia*). Aged 29, he returned to Rome ‘not only better trained, but almost transformed (*non modo exercitator sed prope mutatus*)’.⁹²

In his autobiography Cicero keeps quiet about the fact that, when he was between 15 and 20,⁹³ he had drawn up a plan for a systematic work on eloquence. The only part of it that ever saw the light of day was the first section, the *On Invention*, considered by him in later years as a youthful peccadillo.⁹⁴ The opening of the first book is something only a youth could write. Cicero claims, with what M.L. Clarke termed ‘all the solemnity of a young man of twenty’,⁹⁵ the following:

I have often seriously debated with myself whether men and communities have received more good or evil from oratory and a consuming devotion to eloquence.... For my own part, after long thought, I have been led by reason itself to hold this opinion first and foremost, that wisdom without eloquence does too little for the good of states, but that eloquence without wisdom is generally highly disadvantageous and is never helpful.⁹⁶

So Cicero comes to the conclusion that only eloquence and philosophy together are useful to the community, thus expressing in youthful ingenuity (‘in jugendlicher Genialität’)⁹⁷ his life’s programme—the reconciliation of philosophy and eloquence.

The rhetor’s pupil⁹⁸

The appeal of the school exercises

It has already been seen how the change from Republic to Empire effected a change in the character of public speaking. There was a move from the forum to the school, where the pupils practised—and generally amused themselves with— declamations: *controversiae*

(imaginary court cases) and *suasoriae* (fictitious deliberations). The subjects debated were severely judged by both ancient (cf. the laments of Tacitus, quoted above)⁹⁹ and modern authors as being completely unreal and impractical.¹⁰⁰

Their arguments, however, do not seem wholly justified. The exercises with the *rhetor* were adapted to the age and the psychology of the pupils.¹⁰¹ They satisfied their appetite for beauty, their desire to prove themselves, their intellectual curiosity, their imaginative powers, and even their sense of idealism.¹⁰²

The rhetoric of the school was not forced upon the young. It was only possible for it to catch on and develop because the pupils enjoyed it. Their unfavourable social status obliged the teachers to accommodate their instruction to the pupils' wishes, for, as Petronius remarks, 'they are in a madhouse, and they must gibber. Unless they speak to the taste of their young masters they will be left alone in the colleges, as Cicero says.'¹⁰³

Rhetoricians as well as sophists were practitioners of the well-turned phrase. That the young man was sensitive to this fashion will become obvious when we study the young orator's style. And, as we shall see, the attraction philosophy and poetry exercised on youth was largely dependent on the packaging of its content.¹⁰⁴

At school the pupil was quickly given the impression that he mattered. To borrow the words of G. Kennedy, 'he could give free rein to his emotions, put himself entirely into the case, and release his inner tensions into an act of creation'.¹⁰⁵ There was a tendency to bestow praise: the teacher dared not be strict, the parents—often present in the classroom¹⁰⁶—were naturally blind to their offspring's defects, while the other pupils were lavish with their approval in the hope that, when it came to their turn, they too would receive plaudits.¹⁰⁷

The *controversiae* fulfilled the young man's need for intellectual stimulation: they were a kind of mental 'gymnastics'. They boiled down to making the improbable intellectually palatable through subtlety of reasoning. How intelligent the young man seemed when his arguments won over his audience! To use the words of J.W. Duff, 'Such exercises, incredible though the situations might be, imparted, through the mental gymnastics involved, a nimbleness of mind, a quickness in propounding or refuting arguments, a versatility in treatment, and a finish of speech which again and again fell little short of the amazing.'¹⁰⁸

The exercises at school also flexed the young man's powers of imagination. The world he lived in was one of fantasy and romance. He could indulge his fantasy without let or hindrance; he lived in a dream world peopled by pirates, tyrants, murderers, poisoners, debauched boys and girls, and harsh and indulgent fathers, a world in which he could identify himself with kings and generals, with such figures as Alexander, Caesar, Agamemnon, Cicero. The fact of speaking in the first person singular heightened his sense of personal involvement. Declamation for many Romans was fun, but at the same time, as is contended by G.Kennedy, it had also cathartic functions, as is evident from, for instance, the popularity of cases involving tyrannicide.¹⁰⁹

The fantastical, melodramatic world of the school exercises must also have intrigued the young. An expert pedagogue such as Quintilian would have preferred to have the unreal banned from the schools, yet even he had to compromise a little on his 'ideal':

The subjects chosen for themes should be as true to life as possible, and the actual declamation should, as far as may be, be modelled on the pleadings for which it was devised as training. For we shall hunt in vain [on the forum] for magicians and plagues and oracles and stepmothers more cruel than any in tragedy, and other subjects still more unreal than these. What then? Are we never to permit young men to handle unreal or, to be more accurate, poetic themes that they may run riot and exult in their strength and display their full stature? It were best to prohibit them absolutely. But at any rate the themes, however swelling and magnificent, should not be such as to seem foolish and laughable to the eye of an intelligent observer. Consequently, if we must make some concession, let us allow the declaimer to gorge himself occasionally, as long as he realises that his case will be like that of cattle that have blown themselves out with a surfeit of green food.¹¹⁰

It may seem odd, but some of the subjects treated in the schools satisfied youthful idealism. One could take up the cudgels against tyrants (such as a corrupt emperor like Nero), could argue in favour of the equality of all men, could abolish the differences in status between husband and wife, could react against the capriciousness or excessive severity of fathers, could enter a plea

for brotherly love, could round off proceedings with a peroration against decadent morals or superfluous luxury. The budding 'orators' peppered their tirades with philosophical platitudes which, as will be seen, could make their public wild with enthusiasm. 'The stance taken by a declaimer,' G.Kennedy rightly says, 'is always moral; the sophistic argument that "might makes right" is never acceptable. What the boys learned and what society wanted them to learn was how to preserve moral appearances...it shows the idealism of the schools.'¹¹¹

Studying eloquence

The exercises in the schools of rhetoric demanded study and preparation. It is clear that many youths were willing to put a lot of work into them. Quintilian relates how some of his pupils, acting out of a 'fanatical' (but misplaced) admiration for him, had the notes they had taken in his lectures published under his name.¹¹² The sophist Dionysius of Milete was also 'worshipped' by his students, nicknamed as the 'memory wizards'. He was even suspected of having trained his subjects with the help of magic. Philostratus relates how their exceptional memory was in fact due to their delight at their teacher's declamations, so that they asked him ever again to repeat them.¹¹³ Libanius, too, was successful with at least some of his pupils. On one occasion, on leaving the classroom, one student had noted one point, another a different one, and they met later to reconstruct their idol's argument. For the next three or four days they did nothing but entertain friends, fellow-students and even family with recitations of their teacher's speech.¹¹⁴

The seriousness with which a young man took his training in rhetoric is nicely illustrated by the case of Marcus Aurelius. In his book *On eloquence*, his teacher, Fronto, asks the 24-year-old Marcus whether as a student he has not got any enjoyment out of collecting synonyms, looking up rare words, paraphrasing the texts of the ancient authors, replacing pedestrian expressions by elegant ones, listing comparisons, correctly applying figures of speech, polishing his style by the use of good old words.¹¹⁵ Marcus' conversion to philosophy Fronto considered to be a 'betrayal' of eloquence as is usual with young men (*more iuvenali*),¹¹⁶ the result of laziness:

[With the philosopher] there is no exordium to be carefully elaborated, no marshalling of facts concisely and clearly and skilfully, no dividing of a subject into heads, no arguments to be hunted for, no amplification.... To be sure you would read a book to your philosopher; listen in silence while your master explained it; show by nods that you understood him; while others were reading, you would yourself mostly sleep.... Then you would take your departure without a care, as one who had nothing to think over or write up the whole night long, nothing to recite to a master, nothing to say by heart, no hunting up of words, no garniture of a single word, no garniture of a single synonym, no parallel turning of Greek into our own tongue.¹¹⁷

There can be little doubt that many pupils got pleasure out of the instruction they received at school. 'In our days', as Petronius claims, 'children play at school'¹¹⁸—in itself, not a bad thing. This is not to suggest that it was all plain sailing. According to Quintilian, in addition to the arrogant, self-complacent students who were satisfied with everything they wrote or said, there were those who lacked self-confidence and were never satisfied (*quibus nihil satis est*):

They wish to change everything they have written and to put it in other words. They are a diffident folk, and deserve but ill of their own talents, who think it a mark of precision to cast obstacles in the way of their own writing.... For it is of common occurrence with young men, however talented they may be, to waste their gifts by superfluous elaboration, and to sink into silence through an excessive desire to speak well.

By way of illustration, Quintilian relates how the famous Florus one day met Julius Secundus, a young man 'with an infinite passion for precision', and saw how depressed he was. He asked him why he seemed so down in himself, whereupon Secundus answered that he had still been unable, 'in spite of all his efforts', after three days, to come up with a suitable conclusion to his exercise, 'with the result that he was not only vexed over his immediate difficulty, but had lost all hope of future success'. For Florus there was no reason for Secundus to be so distressed and, smiling, he asked: 'Do you really want to speak better than you can?' Quintilian comments: 'There lies the truth of the whole matter. We must aim at speaking as well as

we can, but must not try to speak better than our nature will permit.'¹¹⁹

There were still further shortcomings against which Quintilian felt called upon to react. Thus he fulminated against pupils who only wanted to treat the easiest and most pleasant aspects of a subject, against those who were crazy about improvisation, who adapted a tone at school different to what would later be necessary in the forum.¹²⁰ He has few illusions on this last score: experience and practice will teach lessons which the classroom cannot.¹²¹ The same author was more than once also critical of those pupils who stay sitting on the school benches virtually until they get grey hairs (*prope consenuerint*). As each day goes by they become more anxious, and the step into real life becomes increasingly difficult. A pupil who stays too long at school does not know what to say later when confronted with reality and finds himself in the forum in a completely strange world.¹²² The great pedagogue is furthermore critical of the tradition whereby speeches made by teacher and pupil alike are greeted with deafening applause, a fashionable custom which was seen as an expression of *humanitas* but which in Quintilian's view was disastrous. School is not a theatre after all! Why should one bother to make an effort if applause is guaranteed? One ought to take the teacher and not his fellow-pupils as model. Such behaviour can only aid and abet self-conceit and vanity. If the teacher suggests to his pupils that he is less than enthusiastic about their performance, then he is a bad teacher. It is certainly intolerable for adolescents (*pueri*) thus to behave, yet young men (*iuvenes*) too must control themselves.¹²³

Young rhetoricians

Doubtless many youngsters declaimed either at school or for a wider public with great pleasure and enthusiasm.¹²⁴ A few texts survive in which the activities of such youthful rhetoricians are described.

Let us start with an illustration from late antiquity. Burgundio, as portrayed by the pen of Sidonius Apollinaris, had hardly recovered from a serious illness when he bombarded Sidonius, the bishop of Clermont-Ferrand, with all kinds of literary problems. If only he could have the opportunity of declaiming in Rome, then the foundations of the Athenaeum in Rome (an 'institute' for letters and recitations founded by Hadrian) would shake with the applause, at least according to the bishop, who had this intuition after hearing a

speech of his young friend's which particularly impressed the 'experts'. At the very moment Sidonius was writing his letter, Burgundio was preparing a panegyric of the emperor, a very difficult task since the budding orator found himself pitched against the achievements of so many famous predecessors. The bishop left the speech itself to the young man who was well up to it. His task, he felt, was to create a favourable climate for the apprentice orator by rounding up an audience and getting them into a receptive mood. Burgundio had nothing to fear, since his patron took care not to invite fault-finders who would be either too critical or jealous. The majority of them were sure to praise his eloquence and ability and to appreciate his diffidence and modesty. It was equally important, after all, that a youngster such as Burgundio (*adulescentem, vel, quod est pulchrius, paene adhuc puerum*) should be praised on account of his sterling character as for his literary qualities.¹²⁵

A letter such as Sidonius' could well have been written several centuries earlier. Burgundio was certainly young, yet there were those who were still younger. The Elder Seneca, for example, writes of a certain Alfius Flavius, a veritable prodigy. He had not yet been clothed with the *toga virilis* before he was famous throughout Rome as a declaimer: people came in droves to Cestius' school to hear the *Wunderkind* take the floor. His teacher could not stop singing his praises, even though he often claimed that he was afraid that such a premature talent would not stand the test of time (*tam immature magnum ingenium non esse vitale*).¹²⁶ His fears were not unfounded. Thus Philostratus relates how at the tender age of 15 Hermogenes was so popular that even Marcus Aurelius himself came to listen to this prodigy, yet his skill vanished completely when he reached maturity.¹²⁷

Not everyone's talent disappeared with adulthood, of course. The Elder Seneca relates how Ovid engaged in declamation as a mere youngster. He was a pupil of Aurelius Fuscus and a fervent admirer of Latro, many of whose aphorisms he worked into his poetry later. His declamations were a sort of poetic prose and had strong psychological overtones. Even at that early stage one can detect the high priest of love at work. Seneca describes how in one of his declamations Ovid defends an adulterous wife. In love it is so much easier to break it off completely than to moderate one's feelings! A love which does not know its crazy moments, which is calculating, which always remains within the bounds of propriety, such a love is an old man's passion! *Senes sic ament!*¹²⁸

Declaimers were, generally speaking, rather conceited, but the youthful practitioners of the art especially could be very arrogant. In Aulus Gellius we find a particularly good example. The author describes a wealthy *adulescens* who was studying Greek and Latin eloquence as a preparation for a career in the forum. One day he burst with a band of supporters into the rhetorician Julian's classroom and asked him if he would mind listening to one of his *controversiae*. Not quite knowing what he was committing himself to, Julian agreed. The youth made his entry and began to declaim 'much more arrogant and stuck up than befitted his age (*arrogantius et elatius, quam aetatem eius decebat*)'. It was up to the *rhetor* to decide on the subject-matter. Julian wanted to put his challenger to the test and presented him with an insoluble dilemma: in a given law-case seven judges were commissioned to pass judgement on the fate of the accused, the result being decided by simple majority; two judges advocate exile, two a monetary fine, and three the death penalty; the defendant was condemned to be executed, but entered a protest against the conviction. The youth had hardly heard the case described before he rushed into discussion without thinking and without waiting for further information. At lightning speed he spewed forth a stream of woolly principles, a pile of garbled ideas, bombarding his listeners with words and sounds, sending his supporters into raptures of delight, while Julian stood there bored stiff. After a lengthy, incoherent tirade, the young man finally ended his speech. His friends ran after Julian, who had already left the classroom, and asked him for his opinion: 'Without controversy (*sine controversia*) this young man is eloquent', he answered with a pun.¹²⁹

The juvenile style¹³⁰

*Exuberance: the youthful characteristic par excellence*¹³¹

Everyone has his own unique style of speech, dictated by social status, character, natural penchant, education or, as Horace claims, age.¹³² Quintilian describes the language typical of younger and of older men. Just as bright garish clothes do not suit an old man, nor does a 'full, haughty, bold and florid style', but rather a 'restrained, mild and precise style'. 'In the young, however, we can

endure a rich and even, perhaps, a risky style. On the other hand, a dry, careful and compressed style is unpleasing in the young, suggesting the affectation of severity, since even the austerity of character that goes with age is considered as premature in young men'.¹³³ And elsewhere the great pedagogue writes:

We cannot demand or expect a perfect style from boys [i.e. adolescents]. But there is greater promise in a certain luxuriance of mind [than in poverty of mind], in ambitious effort and an ardour that leads at times to ideas bordering on the extravagant. I have no objection to a little exuberance in the younger learner.... The young should be more daring and inventive and should rejoice in their inventions, even though correctness and severity are still to be acquired. Exuberance is easily remedied, but barrenness is incurable, be your efforts what they may. To my mind the boy who gives least promise is one in whom the critical faculty develops in advance of the imagination. I like to see the first fruits of the mind copious to excess and almost extravagant in their profusion. The years as they pass will skim off much of the froth, reason will file away many excrescences and something, too, will be removed by what I may perhaps call the wear and tear of life, so long as there is sufficient material to admit of cutting and chiselling away.¹³⁴

It is understandable, even desirable, that a young man's language should be a bit over the top. Already a considerable time before Quintilian, Cicero had expressed a similar view. In his *On the Orator*, the great orator Mark Antony discusses the style of Sulpicius, who was still very young (*adulescentulus*) when he heard him speak in public for the first time. Antony saw immediately that he was dealing with a born public speaker. The young man spoke quickly and impetuously, the result of his genius. His diction in addition was impetuous and a little too exuberant, 'as was natural to that age (*quod erat aetatis*)'. Crassus had no problem with it, 'being well content that luxuriance should exalt itself in the youthful (*volo enim se efferat in adolescente fecunditas*), for...in a young man I want something to prune, because the sap can never live long in anything which has ripened too early'.¹³⁵

A style which is exuberant, daring, imaginative, and full of pathos suits a young man. These were hallmarks of the Asianist

style, so it is only to be expected that the young should have felt drawn to it. An important orator of Cicero's youth was Q.Hortensius Hortalus. When still very young, as we know from Cicero, he introduced Asianism into Rome. He seems to have been more successful in his early years than later in life—in Cicero's view, because he became careless when he grew older and neglected his exercises, but above all because he was a representative of the Asianist style, 'a manner condoned in youth, but less suited to age (*adulescentiae magis concessum quam senectuti*)'. As a youth, therefore, he was successful, but not with everybody: the younger generation (*adulescentes*) was filled with admiration, but the older men (*senes*) could not appreciate his 'show' at all. 'How often have I seen Philippus', Cicero writes, 'listening to him with a derisive smile, sometimes even with anger and impatience?'¹³⁶

As a young man Cicero too was an Asianist. In his earliest speeches he tended to be particularly impetuous and exuberant: 'It was my habit to speak without variety of modulation and with voice and whole body at high tension.' As we have seen already, for medical and/or political reasons he set off for a study-trip to Greece; here the rhetorician Molo on Rhodes 'cured' him of his over-baroque youthful style:

He made it his task to repress if possible the redundance and excess of my style, which was marked by a youthful impetuosity and lack of restraint (*iuvenili quadam dicendi impunitate et licentia*) and to check it so to speak from overflowing its banks. Thus I came back after a two years' absence not only better trained, but almost transformed (*prope mutatus*). My voice was no longer overstrained, my language had lost its froth, my lungs had gained strength and my body had put on weight.¹³⁷

When Cicero emphasizes the excesses of his youthful style, he is writing with an apologetic intention. At the peak of his fame he encountered stiff opposition and the—not totally unjustified—accusation of Asianism. As Quintilian writes, 'even his own contemporaries ventured to attack him on the ground that he was bombastic, Asiatic, redundant, given to excessive repetition, liable at times to be pointless in his witticisms, sensuous, extravagant and (an outrageous accusation!) almost effeminate in his rhythm'.¹³⁸ Against his opponents—the Atticists, who advocated a classic, sober

style—Cicero stated that he was an Asianist as a youth but that his style reached maturity as the years went by.

It is important in this regard to note that the Atticism, the antithesis of Asianism, was a movement of young men. Their most prominent spokesman was Calvus, who also happened to be a poet (a *poeta novus*), and became Cicero's greatest rival in eloquence. Possibly he was even the founder of Atticism as a conscious literary school.¹³⁹ The difference between him and Cicero is excellently described by A.D.Leeman:

The basic difference between Cicero and men as Calvus is clear. Whereas Cicero enriched his *copia rerum et verborum* with all means and devices, whether Attic and 'classic' or Hellenistic and 'modern', and employed them solely according to their effect on the general public, the Atticists were more selective and artistic, and preferred classical harmony to Hellenistic extravagance. Their aesthetic ideals were more ascetic and more exacting than those of Cicero. It is the attitude of 'in der Beschränkung zeigt sich der Meister' against that of 'prendre son bien où on le trouve'.¹⁴⁰

As if to spite Cicero, who considered himself the only true Atticist, with Demosthenes as model, the Atticists modelled themselves on Lysias. A few—according to Cicero, a new kind of inexperienced people (*novum quoddam imperitorum genus*)—went even further and sought their inspiration in Thucydides,¹⁴¹ whom they raved about on account, doubtless, of his sophisticated crudeness. The word *imperiti* seems to refer to a movement of youngsters.¹⁴² One of them was Asinius Pollio, well known for his virulent dislike of Cicero, who began his career as orator at the age of 22 in 54 BC.¹⁴³

Cicero's opponents in eloquence were young linguistic purists who advocated an extremely sober style. At first sight it seems somewhat odd for young people to act as it were against the 'law' of their age. Several factors, however, explain their attitude: the youthful desire for reform and novelty, their love for toppling received values (in this case embodied by Cicero), their obsession with the 'perfect form', and the fact that asceticism and rigour were just as typical of the young as rebelliousness and exuberance.¹⁴⁴ Moreover, such an orator as Calvus most probably was not as cool, dull and unpopular as his great rival Cicero would have us believe. His public appearances

were actually fired with passion and crowned with success, plaudits being particularly forthcoming from the young.¹⁴⁵

The young, always given to extremes, could write in either a very sober style or a singularly bombastic one. Generally they tended to favour a baroque style.¹⁴⁶ This explains their distaste for a 'familiar' one¹⁴⁷ and their enthusiasm for the 'new' style which became popular in the early days of the Empire. This appears clearly from the following words of Quintilian: '[Pupils] must not be permitted to fall victims to the pernicious allurements of the precious blooms produced by our modern euphuists, thus acquiring a passion for the luscious sweetness of such authors, whose charm is all the more attractive to boyish intellects because it is so easy to achieve.'¹⁴⁸ The chief exponent of the new style was Seneca. His language was characterized by antitheses, asymmetry, puns, alliteration, paradoxes, unnatural expressions, aphorisms, a tendency to obscurantism, poetic flights of fancy. Quintilian thought his style totally corrupt, yet his success with the young, who tried hard to emulate his sweet vices (*dulcia vitia*) remained unequalled.¹⁴⁹

*Other characteristics*¹⁵⁰

That a young man could fall under the spell of the 'beautiful word' is apparent from a text of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. His *On the Arrangements of Words* was intended as a birthday present for the young Roman Metilius Rufus. The author considers the most important features of a speech to be *inventio* (the elucidation of arguments) and *elocutio* (the style). The first-mentioned is difficult to master, requires a wealth of practical experience and is thus an affair more easily acquired by adults than by the young. The latter, the search for the beautiful word, on the other hand, seems to be the typical area of young people who go into ecstasy when they hear a brilliant expression.¹⁵¹

The fanaticism concerning an elegant style is evident in the almost physical disgust that a young man experienced on first perusal of a carelessly and clumsily written book. The case of the young Augustine illustrates this phenomenon in a remarkable way. It was by reading Cicero's *Hortensius* that, at the age of 18, he became intrigued by philosophy.¹⁵² For one brief moment he thought of satisfying his metaphysical curiosity in the pages of Holy Scripture, which was not a totally closed book to him, given that his mother

Monica was a Christian. He was to be bitterly disappointed, however:

And this is what met me: something neither open to the proud nor laid bare to mere children.... It seemed to me unworthy in comparison with the dignity of Cicero.... My inflated conceit shunned the Bible's restraint, and my gaze never penetrated to its inwardness. Yet the Bible was composed in such a way that as beginners mature, its meaning grows with them. I disdained to be a little beginner. Puffed up with pride, I considered myself a mature adult (*sed ego dedignabar esse parvulus et turgidus fastu mihi grandis videbar*).¹⁵³

A polished style was the young man's passion, even to the degree of his attaching more importance to style than to content. 'If it sounds well and glitters, it doesn't matter what it is worth', Quintilian complained.¹⁵⁴ It was for that reason that flowery words and short pointed sayings (*sententiae*) greatly appealed to the young,¹⁵⁵ even if they were meaningless and absurd. The Elder Seneca said straight out that especially *adulescentuli* were infected.¹⁵⁶ And Tacitus relates how

young men, still at the malleable stage of their education, hang around public speakers in order to improve themselves, are eager not only to hear but also to take home with them some striking and memorable utterance; they pass it on from mouth to mouth, and often quote in their home correspondence with country towns and provinces, whether it be the flash of an epigram embodying some conceit in pointed and terse phraseology, or the glamour of some passage of choice poetical beauty.¹⁵⁷

In Roman rhetoric great importance was attached to the pithy, brilliant sentence. The individual word¹⁵⁸ was often just as important. Quintilian relates how many pupils were constantly looking for the right word, restless until they had found it, and until they had pondered upon it and considered it in all possible aspects.¹⁵⁹ This obsession with the 'right' word quickly slipped into artificiality and a certain obscurantism. The fact that Cicero mentions that these characteristics upset the elders¹⁶⁰ seems to suggest that this was not the case at all with young people.

During the second century AD the trend towards archaism in Latin literature reached a climax: Virgil and Cicero were superseded by the Elder Cato and Ennius as the towering authors of Latin literature. The young most probably played a significant role in this literary—but also moral—process. In one of his chapters Aulus Gellius describes a youth ‘who was very fond of old words and made a display in his ordinary, everyday conversation of many expressions that were altogether too unfamiliar and archaic’. The philosopher Favorinus reprimanded him on account of his unusual language. When the older Romans spoke, he said, they expressed themselves simply in the common language of their own day:

You, on the contrary, just as if you were talking to-day with Evander’s mother, use words that have already been obsolete for many years, because you want no one to know and comprehend what you are saying (*quod scire atque intellegere neminem vis quae dicas*). Why not accomplish your purpose more fully, foolish fellow, and say nothing at all. But you assert that you love the olden time, because it is honest, sterling, sober and temperate. Live by all means according to the manners of the past, but speak in the language of the present.¹⁶¹

By adopting eccentric vocabulary, a young man hoped to demonstrate not only his erudition but also his originality. He liked to speak in riddles and to express himself in abstruse language.¹⁶² He was anxious to be noticed. This last aspect was also obvious in his deportment as an orator. Under the Empire there were many who acted more like singers and dancers than like public speakers, attracting attention to themselves by their sissy, sing-song voices. The declaimer Fuscus, as the Elder Seneca writes, was famous for this and, doubtless on this ground, very popular with students: ‘I recall that, in my youth, nothing was more familiar than [the declamations] of Fuscus; all of us, with differing inflections of voice, used to intone them, each, as it were, in his own key.’¹⁶³ Where the same Seneca describes the dandyish youths (and orators) of his day, he mentions ‘the refining of their voice till it is as caressing as a woman’s’.¹⁶⁴ The impression the young advocates (*adulescentuli obscuri*) of the day made on Pliny was also very negative: ‘I am ashamed to describe the speeches of today, the mincing accents in which they are delivered, and the puerile applause they receive.

That sort of sing-song needs only the clapping and tambourines of Cybele to complete it, for of howling (no other word can express this applause which would be indecent even in the theatre) there is more than enough.¹⁶⁵

PHILOSOPHY¹⁶⁶

From the time of Plato and Isocrates there was a keen rivalry between philosophers and rhetoricians.¹⁶⁷ For centuries they argued between themselves, with varying degrees of success, about who should educate the young. The interest of youth in eloquence will already be evident from the preceding section. Philosophy too managed to fascinate many among them, despite the widespread opposition to interest in this discipline in various Roman circles.

Opposition to philosophy¹⁶⁸

‘Public opinion’ was generally rather suspicious of philosophy, ‘so remote from reality’, and it considered too intensive a study of the subject as pointless, a waste of time. This was already the case in Athens in Plato’s day,¹⁶⁹ and it was even more true of the pragmatically minded Romans. ‘Philosophy’, Ennius tells us, ‘is necessary, but only in moderation. Total dedication to philosophy is quite unbecoming.’¹⁷⁰ In Seneca one reads of how a young man who had forsaken a promising future in politics so as to devote himself in tranquillity and isolation to philosophy was mocked and abused as a good-for-nothing and a lazy-bones: *nugatorium et inertem vocant*.¹⁷¹

In the eyes of many parents, philosophy was certainly no fit preparation for ‘real’ life. This fact emerges clearly from Epictetus’ writings, where the philosopher mentions a list of arguments which his students could use in defending themselves against suspicious parents.¹⁷² Tacitus, for his part, relates how Agricola as a very young man (*prima in iuventa*) had devoted himself to philosophy ‘with more enthusiasm than was becoming in a Roman’, especially a well-born Roman. His considerable enthusiasm was cooled the older and more intellectually mature he became, but also thanks to his mother who knew how to tackle —and restrain—him ‘intelligently’.¹⁷³

Obviously enough, the rhetoricians too were opposed to a philosophical training. Quintilian, for example, set his face

against those who, in his opinion at any rate, took refuge in philosophy and law from sheer laziness (*taedium laboris*), keeping dumb from idleness. The situation is worst where students of philosophy are concerned:

[They] are the victims of a more arrogant form of sloth; they assume a stern air and let their beards grow, and, as though despising the precepts of oratory, sit for a while in the schools of the philosophers, that, by an assumption of a severe mien before the public gaze and by an affected contempt of others they may assert their moral superiority, while leading a life of debauchery at home. For philosophy may be counterfeited, but eloquence never.¹⁷⁴

At certain stages the state felt itself threatened by the philosophers. In early days, the conservative Roman saw them as a threat to the *mos maiorum*, and more than once we read of philosophers who were banished from Rome. A story related by Plutarch concerning an event which occurred in 155 BC is our best source of information on this phenomenon. When Carneades was in residence in Rome as an envoy, he profited from his stay to deliver speeches. The young came in large numbers to hear him 'and became devoted and admiring listeners'. This philosopher had infused a tremendous passion into the youth (*ἔρωτα δεινὸν ἐμβέβληκε τοῖς νέοις*) for philosophy, in consequence of which they forsook their other pleasures and pursuits and were 'possessed' by philosophy. Many Roman parents did not object, and in fact were pleased to see their children lay hold of Greek culture. But the Elder Cato as a fanatic defender of the old customs opposed this zeal for philosophy and discussion, fearing lest the young men, by giving this direction to their ambition, should come to love a reputation based on words more than one achieved by martial deeds. He managed to arrange that Carneades and his colleagues were banned from Rome and that 'the youth of Rome gave ear to their laws and magistrates, as heretofore'.¹⁷⁵

We also read of philosophers who, during the first century AD, were judged dangerous to the imperial regime on account of their frankness and were banished from Rome.¹⁷⁶ Nonetheless, large numbers of young people were, especially in those days, attracted to philosophy, some on account of its usefulness in

developing the art of oratory, others because philosophy offered them a spiritual anchor.

A more light-hearted approach to philosophy¹⁷⁷

Not all pupils went to a philosopher's class so as to learn how to live life more fully. Examples are numerous, but nowhere do we gain more penetrating insight into students of philosophy than in Plutarch's tract on *The Art of Listening*, written for a certain Nicander, who had just taken the adult toga and had in future, in the eyes of this philosopher, to follow the counsels of reason rather than those of passion.¹⁷⁸

It was Plutarch's view that silence was an adornment to a young man, an art he should cultivate even if most young men were incapable of it. Many listened to a teacher, with their mouths hanging open, imbibing all sorts of silly nonsense, yet they could not bear anyone urging improvement of their lifestyle upon them. They wanted to prove their point and to refute the arguments of others. There were those who just could not keep still, who got excited at every word and voiced loud-mouthed objections, who constantly interrupted a speaker or were on their feet to answer him back before he had sat down. Others, either through vanity or ambition, were jealous of the speaker, resentfully listened to his speech, were disappointed if he scored a success, were continually distracted and paid attention only to those criticizing the speech delivered. By contrast to the inveterate critics, there were those who swallowed everything they heard, hook, line and sinker, who bowed to the authority of the philosopher, who were impressed by his grey hair, the modulation of his voice, his affected seriousness, or by the cries, noise and stamping of the audience. Such superficial and capricious pupils were totally lacking in critical spirit. At every word, even every syllable, they jumped to their feet to applaud as if they were in a theatre. No superlatives were grandiloquent enough to express their admiration: it was 'divine', 'with divine inspiration', 'unbeatably good'. The behaviour of the blasé, complacent type was very different again. No matter what was said, such a youth remained unmoved, acted as if he could do better, and gave the impression that there was nothing left which could surprise him. Through his silence, his assumed seriousness and pose, he attempted to create the impression that he was a pensive individual. A rebuke delivered by the teacher provoked a variety of reactions.

There were those who could not be shamed, with whom scolding ran like water off a duck's back, who sat there quite unruffled and even sniggered with a disdainful smile whenever they were put in their place. There were others who did have a sense of shame but lacked backbone. At the least criticism they turned their backs on philosophy and took refuge in the company of flatterers and sycophants.

In Plutarch's opinion, the study of philosophy was certainly no easy matter. The pupil simply had to grin and bear it. Those who were slow on the uptake should not lose heart, even when ridiculed by the brighter students: through hard work they could overcome their failure to understand, because what is remembered with difficulty remains permanently and safely imprinted upon the memory. Such students, who were not very clever, could annoy their teacher by constantly asking questions, judicious or injudicious, about the same thing because they were simply too lazy to do their homework. The pupils who tried to establish a reputation for attentiveness and shrewdness were also a nuisance: they managed to torment the teacher and hold up the smooth progress of the class by their exaggerated industriousness and talkativeness and by the superfluous questions they asked; they constantly detected difficulties where there were none, they kept acquiring evidence when in fact there was nothing to be proved. The diffident, silent youngsters who, on account of their shy disposition and a desire to spare the teacher, dared not ask questions and kept nodding assent even if they had not a clue about what was being said, were very different. The behaviour of the ambitious, reckless students who tried to show how shrewd they were, but who in fact kept having to cover up their ignorance, was again another matter. There were still other students who, instead of posing serious questions, tried to lure the lecturer into discussing trivial problems and persisted in annoying him with ingenious but silly pseudo-problems. Their greatest thrill was to get the teacher out of his depth. In this way they attempted to put him to the test, to get him to confess his ignorance and thereby show how clever they themselves were.¹⁷⁹

Philosophy as a vocation¹⁸⁰

For many in antiquity, philosophy was tantamount to being a religion, and often those who felt called to study philosophy saw

their vocation as a sort of conversion. A remarkable feature of such conversions seems to us that they were most common among the young.

Famous examples of ‘converts’ to philosophy in Greek antiquity were Polemo (fourth century BC) and the female philosopher Hipparchia (c. 300 Bc),¹⁸¹ while the first important example in the Roman world was Cicero. According to himself, he felt a vocation to philosophy when he was about 18 and fell under the spell of the academic philosopher Philon of Larissa, to whom he devoted himself totally: *admirabili quodam ad philosophiam studio concitatus*. The sheer diversity and weight of the problems treated sent him into a state of ecstasy. The fact that at that moment the oratory of the forum seemed to have no future was an additional excitement, and in fact the young Cicero went so far as to consider dedicating his whole life to philosophy.¹⁸²

The young Virgil also passed through a philosophical ‘crisis’. When aged about 17, he fell under the spell of Epicureanism. In a poem of the *Appendix Vergiliana*, generally considered authentic, he bids adieu to rhetoric’s hollow bombast, to his friends and even (although not completely) to the art of poetry, in spite of how dear it was to him. He is determined to allow the frivolous muse access to his life only from time to time and to devote himself entirely to the school of the mighty Siro, in whose teaching he has discovered a safe harbour, as well as release from all the inner turbulence which torments him.¹⁸³

The Stoic Cornutus meant much the same to Persius as Siro to Virgil. Shortly after putting on the adult toga, Persius got into a confused state and attached himself unconditionally to this philosopher. The verses in which the poet describes his conversion to Stoicism and expresses his gratitude to Cornutus are moving. Cornutus had formed his as yet tender spirit, had taken him, callow youth that he was, under his wing, and given his life a definite sense of direction. His teacher had become his most intimate friend, his *alter ego*. Their souls fused, they were fired by the same ideals.¹⁸⁴

Seneca felt a vocation to philosophy at about the same age. As a student he idolized the Stoic Attalus: he was the first to arrive at school, the last to leave. Outside school hours he also hung about with his teacher and kept firing all sorts of questions at him. The major influence exerted by an idol on youth emerges clearly from the following quotation:

‘When I used to hear Attalus denouncing sin, error, and the evils of life, I often felt sorry for mankind and regarded Attalus as a noble and majestic being,—above our mortal heights. He called himself a king, but I thought him more than a king, because he was entitled to pass judgment on kings. And in truth, when he began to uphold poverty, and to show what a useless and dangerous burden was everything that passed the measure of our need, I often desired to leave his lecture-room a poor man. Whenever he castigated our pleasure-seeking lives, and extolled personal purity, moderation in diet, and a mind free from unnecessary, not to speak of unlawful, pleasures, the desire came upon me to limit my food and drink.’¹⁸⁵

It would be possible to cite further examples,¹⁸⁶ yet suffice it to round this sector off with Augustine’s conversion to philosophy. He received his first intellectual ‘shock’ when he was a mere 18. When working his way through books on eloquence he came across the *Hortensius* of ‘a certain Cicero, whose language (but not his heart) almost everyone admires’. This work from the pen of the great orator, most of which is now lost, contained an incitement to philosophical studies and took the young man by storm:

The book changed my feelings. It altered my prayers, Lord, to be toward you yourself. It gave me different values and priorities. Suddenly every vain hope became empty to me, and I longed for the immortality of wisdom with an incredible ardour in my heart (*incredibili aestu cordis*). I began to rise up to return to you. For I did not read the book for a sharpening of my style... I was impressed not by the book’s refining effect on my style and literary expression but by the content. My God, how I burned, how I burned with longing to leave earthly things and fly back to you.... The one thing that delighted me in Cicero’s exhortation was the advice ‘not to study one particular sect but to love and seek and pursue and hold fast and strongly embrace wisdom itself, wherever found’ (*ipsam quaecumque esset sapientiam*).¹⁸⁷

Why philosophy attracted youth¹⁸⁸

It is obvious that philosophy was a popular subject with studious youngsters. Not all motivation was equally 'pure', nor did it always reflect a real philosophic disposition, yet many young people took life very seriously, and were single-minded in their search for truth and insight and for an absolute standard by which to live.

Less 'pure' motives

Among the less pure motives were an obsession with the well-turned phrase and the dialectical sparring-match. That young men were keen on elegant use of language¹⁸⁹ should already be apparent from the earlier chapter on eloquence. Serious philosophers were withering in their criticism of young men who felt attracted to philosophy for that reason only. Thus Plutarch is of the opinion that young people run the risk of being seduced by the reputation of the speaker, by a fine delivery, by beautiful but empty words, a melodious voice, a pleasing and copious style.¹⁹⁰

It was above all *sententiae*, pithy aphorisms or proverbs, which sent a youthful audience into transports of ecstasy. These *bon mots* often made little sense, yet when they had something to say they were an excellent pedagogical device. This fact emerges clearly from the letter in which Seneca describes his youthful philosophical crisis. Rambling, theoretical diatribes against vice rarely made any significant impact. One single expression, on the other hand, especially if it were in verse form, really did strike home:

Even men in whose opinion nothing is enough, wonder and applaud when they hear such words, and swear eternal hatred against money.... They are stirred up by high-sounding phrases, and adapt themselves to the emotions of the speaker with lively change of face and mind.... But the true hearer is ravished and stirred by the beauty of the subject matter, not by the jingle of empty words. When a bold word has been uttered in defiance of death, or a saucy fling in defiance of Fortune, we take delight in acting straightaway upon that which we have heard. Men are impressed by such words, and become what they are bidden to be, should but the impression abide in the mind, and should the populace, who discourage honourable things, not immediately lie in wait to rob them of

this noble impulse; only a few can carry home the mental attitude with which they were inspired.¹⁹¹

In this passage Seneca is probably too optimistic about the power exercised by the words of a philosopher—but possibly rightly pessimistic about the bad influence of the ‘outside world’ on youth. Generally speaking, he sounds a warning bell about philosophers who are really indistinguishable from rhetoricians, because, as he so pointedly observes, ‘philosophy should teach the art of living, not of public speaking (*facere docet philosophia, non dicere*)’.¹⁹²

‘Real’ philosophers mistrusted ‘the jingle of empty words’. They were equally suspicious of too great an interest being shown in dialectic, for many young people the most fascinating aspect of philosophy.¹⁹³

From Plutarch we learn that virtually all students concentrated on those parts of philosophy that could contribute to making their reputation. Some students, he says, were interested in physics while others, like young pups, dismembered everything and tore it to ribbons, threw themselves into discussions, talked complicated problems, engaged in sophistry and dialectic enlivened by all sorts of hair-splittings.¹⁹⁴

What Plutarch says is neatly illustrated by a text from Aulus Gellius. On the occasion of a student party where the famous sophist Herodes Atticus was among the guests, a young student, in his own opinion a Stoic but according to Gellius a cocky blabbermouth, overwhelmed those present with a non-stop flow of all sorts of philosophical theory. Rattling on endlessly, he spewed out obscure words, syllogisms and dialectic subtleties. He was the only one who could resolve the most complicated sophisms; he had studied all philosophical problems more profoundly than anyone else; he had a ready solution for everything; no setback could upset his peace of mind. To the immense relief of his captive audience, the deluge of verbiage did finally come to an end. Herodes Atticus did not hazard a direct reply to such a genius. Instead he suggested that he listen to a passage from Epictetus in which this philosopher read the riot act to youngsters who frittered away their time with quibbles and trivialities. After the reading of this text the cocky young man, realizing how accurately these words applied to him, instantly lapsed into silence and drew the appropriate conclusions.¹⁹⁵

'Pure' motives

Having looked at some of the less pure motives which explain the popularity of philosophy with the young, it is time to deal with the probably less numerous, but certainly no less typical or interesting, young men who turned to philosophy to provide an insight into the mysteries of existence and a moral crutch.

It has already been seen how, through reading Cicero's *Hortensius*, the young Augustine was overcome with an almost insatiable thirst for the truth, 'whatever it may have been'. In the first instance he thought of turning to the Holy Scriptures for his intellectual firm ground, yet he was put off by the clumsy language.¹⁹⁶ In this way Augustine ended up for many years with the Manichees,¹⁹⁷ a dualist sect which claimed to possess the truth. As he himself informs us, at that time his youthful mind was obsessed by a longing for truth (*adulescentis animus cupidus veri*)¹⁹⁸ and above all disturbed by the problem of evil, a problem to which the Manichees claimed to have a ready answer. As is evident from the opening words of his tract *On the Profit of Believing*, at this age he was also highly impressed by the claim of that sect to be in possession of a scientific doctrine which did not require blind assent as Christianity did:

For you know, Honoratus, that for no other reason we fell in with such men, than because they used to say, that, apart from all terror of authority, by pure and simple reason, they would lead within to God, and set free from all error those who were willing to be their hearers. For what else constrained me, during nearly nine years...to be a follower and diligent hearer of those men, save that they said that we [Christians] are alarmed by superstition, and are commanded to have faith before reason, but that they urge no one to have faith, without having first discussed and made clear the truth? Who would not be enticed by such promises, especially the mind of a young man desirous of the truth (*praesertim adulescentis animus cupidus veri*), and further a proud and talkative mind by discussions of certain learned men in the school? Such as they then found me, disdainful forsooth as of old wives' fables, and desirous to grasp and drink in, what they promised, the open and pure Truth?¹⁹⁹

Thus he poured all his energies into promoting Manichaeism in (successful!) debates with Christians. In addition to the factors already mentioned, there were still other features of the doctrine that heightened his youthful ardour (*adulescentis animositas*) and made him a passionate advocate of the sect:

But two things especially, which easily lay hold upon that unwary age (*incauta aetas*), urged me through wonderful circuits. One of these was familiarity, suddenly, by a certain false semblance of goodness, wrapped many times around my neck as a certain sinuous chain. The other was, that I was almost always noxiously victorious in arguing with ignorant Christians who yet eagerly attempted, each as he could, to defend their faith. By which frequent success the ardour of youth (*adulescentis animositas*) was kindled, and by its own impulse rashly verged upon the great evil of stubbornness.²⁰⁰

Augustine's was not an isolated case. There was his friend, the youthful Nebridius, for example, who followed his idol from Rome to Milan quite simply because he was driven 'by an abnormally strong impulsion towards wisdom and truth'. Like his older friend, he too was passionately seeking 'a blessed life, persistent in his exploration of difficult problems'.²⁰¹ The Church Father elaborates on this extract from his *Confessions* in one of his letters. He remembers his old friend as a youth who had a feverish intellect, who sought an answer to the most difficult and obscure problems, who saw problems at every turn and was constantly posing questions, for whom no answer could be complete enough and who was quite indignant if someone wanted to fob him off with laconic answers.²⁰²

It was doubtless the case that in earlier times too many young people, like Augustine and Nebridius, turned to philosophy for insight into the mystery of being, for a universal and systematic *Weltanschauung*. Above all else, however, a young man looked for guidance, a rule of life, a standard by which to act.

In the chaotic days of the Late Republic, certain young men—such as Virgil and Horace—felt they could find this ethical standard in Epicureanism, whose adherents were promised freedom from fear of the gods and of death, and which called upon them to flee from a corrupt society, to refrain from involvement in politics and to seek joy in friendship and peace of mind.²⁰³ The greatest

attraction for youth, however, was exerted by more ascetic systems such as Stoicism, Cynicism, Neoplatonism or Neopythagoreanism. All these systems advocated a strict, ascetic code of ethics and exalted religious opinions. Both features contributed to making these systems attractive to many youths of the day.

Marcus Aurelius, the future philosopher-emperor, felt himself called to philosophy for the first time at an exceptionally young age. His biographer informs us that at the age of 12 he adopted the clothes, and later the mentality, of a philosopher: he dressed in a shaggy coat and slept on the floor; it took his mother a lot of energy to persuade him to sleep on an animal-hair bed.²⁰⁴ Philostratus reveals how in the case of Apollonius of Tyana an interest in philosophy manifested itself also very early, at the tender age of 14 in fact. He familiarized himself with various philosophical systems but when he was 16 soaked himself in Pythagoreanism, 'driven as it were by some super-human force'. As of that moment he decided to forgo meat and wine, went around barefoot, let his hair grow long and insisted on dressing himself in linen clothes since he did not want to wear any fibre derived from animals. He renounced marriage and, according to his biographer, never allowed himself to succumb to love.²⁰⁵

As we know, Seneca as a youth had also already undergone a philosophical crisis at about 15. At this age he came under the spell of the Stoic Attalus and the Neopythagorean Sotion. The latter persuaded him to become a vegetarian. This teacher referred to the arguments of Sextius and Pythagoras. In the opinion of Sextius, a Roman philosopher of the time of Augustus, eating meat was the consequence of human cruelty and, in any case, dangerous to health; for Pythagoras renunciation of meat was linked to the transmigration of the soul. So many well-known people believed in transmigration of the soul (for a young man, an excellent reason for believing in it!) that one had nothing to lose by accepting the doctrine: either the teaching was true, or it was false, but even then a vegetarian lifestyle still remained useful as contributing to general sobriety.

Seneca let himself be convinced by these arguments: 'I was imbued with this teaching, and began to abstain from animal food; at the end of a year the habit was as pleasant as it was easy. I was beginning to feel that my mind was more active;²⁰⁶ though I would not to-day positively state whether it really was or not'

In what follows Seneca mentions the reasons why he nonetheless abandoned vegetarianism. In the first years of Tiberius' government, devotees of Eastern mystery cults paraded through the streets of Rome. They, too, advocated turning one's back on meat. His father who, unlike his mother, disapproved of philosophy (*philosophiam oderat*), worried about his son's weak health; he totally condemned his asceticism and managed to get him to abandon his vegetarian life-style, but he could not prevent him from sleeping on a hard bed, something Attalus had taught him.

We have seen how, under the influence of his 'idol' Attalus, young Seneca declared war on wealth, sensuality and greed: 'For I had planned my whole life with great resolve. And later, when I returned to the duties of a citizen, I did indeed keep a few of these good resolutions.' These 'few' things were still quite impressive. He reframed from oysters, mushrooms, wine, sweat-baths, perfumes. 'Other resolutions have been broken, but after all in such a way that, in cases where I ceased to practise abstinence, I have observed a limit which is indeed next door to abstinence; perhaps it is even a little more difficult, because it is easier for the will to cut off certain things utterly than to use them with restraint.'

From the foregoing it is clear that Seneca held 'the enthusiasm with which he engaged himself in philosophy as a young man' in higher esteem than the 'shallowness with which he persisted in it as an old man'. In Seneca's opinion, as reflected by this letter at least, one's youth is the happiest period of one's life: 'For when the mind is young, it may most easily be won over to desire what is honourable and upright; truth, if she can obtain a suitable pleader, will lay strong hands upon those who can still be taught, those who have been but superficially spoiled.'

I have mentioned all this in order to show you how zealous neophytes are with regard to their first impulses towards the highest ideals (*quam vehementes haberent tirunculi impetus primos ad optima quaeque*), provided that someone does his part in exhorting them and in kindling their ardour. There are indeed mistakes made, through the fault of our advisers, who teach us how to debate and not how to live; there are also mistakes made by the pupils, who come to their teachers to develop, not their souls, but their wits. Thus the study for wisdom has become the study of words (*quae philosophia fuit, facta philologia est*).²⁰⁷

A life of asceticism had an appeal for some of the young: a shabby appearance, a hard bed to lie on, renunciation of all sorts of food and sexual contact. The danger of slipping into extremism was ever-present. This fact emerges clearly from Lucian, who describes how the philosopher Nigrinus vented his anger against some of his colleagues who asked too great a sacrifice of their pupils, who forced them to walk barefoot, and scourged them even to the extent of drawing blood. Some of the pupils even collapsed after the infliction of such chastisement.²⁰⁸

It should be made clear that asceticism was not always necessarily the consequence of a serious attitude to philosophy. It could easily become an expression of snobbery, a device for distancing oneself from one's environment and for attracting attention. The Stoic Epictetus, for example, was critical of pupils who, once they felt the prompting of a vocation to philosophy, let their hair grow, donned a threadbare coat, exposed their naked shoulder, no longer took a bath and went off to see the philosopher dirty and unwashed. He asked his pupils to be modest and not to brag about drinking nothing but water. He found it very praiseworthy in the young that they should remain chaste until the day of their wedding and that they should only indulge in 'approved' sex, but he found it inappropriate that they should turn their noses up at those who could not exercise restraint, and brag about their own self-imposed celibacy.²⁰⁹

From philosophy to religion²¹⁰

In addition to advocating a rigorous asceticism, most philosophical systems also propounded a lofty religious piety. Traditional religion, especially during the Empire, was unable to meet the requirements of the thinking man. Philosophy became a real religion for many people in those days, not only for the intellectuals.

The Stoa propounded not only a strict moral code but also an elevated image of the divine. Typical is Epictetus, perhaps the most religious of all the Stoics. The Supreme Being he presented to his pupils was a personal God with whom the individual enjoyed an intimate relationship, who watched over him through the instrument of divine providence, whom nothing, even the most intimate thoughts and actions, escaped. His audience, he felt, ought to lead a religious life according to God's law and to implore divine

assistance in trying circumstances. After death man returned to the God who made him.²¹¹

The religious message of the philosophers provoked a variety of reactions, as indeed did philosophy itself. Some embraced this religious dimension with open arms because it enabled them to parade their knowledge of religion before others without themselves having any authentic religious feelings. One such person was a young man described by Lucian. He overwhelmed his family with a barrage of dialectical subtleties and put it to them that God was not only in heaven but permeated everything, wood, stone, animals.²¹² In contrast with such a 'pseudo-believer' were those who were genuinely 'high' on religion but easily slipped into extremism. Epictetus, for example, described pupils who saw their bodies as an encumbrance, who were dissatisfied with the need to eat, drink, sleep and wash, and who wanted to return to the God who created them.²¹³

The aversion to one's own body—and the yearning for God—could be so great that it led to suicide. We know of no clear example from the Roman period, but it is said that the pupils—doubtless in the first instance youths—of the third-century BC philosopher Hegesias (nicknamed 'Peisithanatos', 'persuading to die') were moved by his pessimistic teaching in such a degree that most of them committed suicide.²¹⁴

In addition to going through a philosophical crisis, serious-minded youngsters went through the throes of a religious crisis too. The religious dimension of philosophy was a stimulus to live one's life not only according to the law of nature but also according to God's law.

Stoicism was very popular during the late Republic and the early Empire. It began to lose its appeal quite sharply during the second century AD. However religious this philosophical system may in fact have been, for the majority of mystically inclined people of late antiquity it was not sufficiently pious. In those days pious people were no longer looking for peace of soul but rather for holiness; they wanted to be redeemed from this miserable existence and to be totally absorbed by the Godhead.²¹⁵ These aspirations were best accommodated by Neoplatonism, *the* philosophy of late antiquity, and, at an earlier period, Neopythagoreanism. In both philosophical schools, philosophy and religion intermingled.

Neopythagoreanism had many of the traits of a religious sect. According to Iamblichus, this was already true of early

Pythagoreanism—Pythagoras’ disciples would have lived in a sort of religious community. They were only admitted after a grilling enquiry, had to observe silence for five years, pooled all their belongings, took a vow of poverty, practised a rigorous asceticism, followed a strict timetable, prayed and read in common.²¹⁶ The same Iamblichus is doubtless to be believed when saying that Pythagoras exerted a great attraction on youth and recruited the majority of his followers from the young.²¹⁷ As we know, this philosopher, who was born in Samos, taught in Croton, a city in southern Italy. Livy too states for a fact that he was surrounded there by youngsters who were fanatically devoted to his philosophy: *iuvenum aemulantium studia coetus habuisse constat*.²¹⁸

Apollonius of Tyana was a Neopythagorean sage born in Cappadocia, presumably early in the Christian era. At the age of 16 he was prompted, ‘as if by a divine power’, to adopt a Pythagorean life-style. In his biography, written by Philostratus, he comes across as an ascetic wandering teacher, a miracle-worker and prophet, a contemporary—and counterpart—of Christ’s. This philosopher would have exercised an especially strong attraction on the young. One day, on arriving in the Piraeus, he came upon a group of philosophy students busy studying, discussing and preparing speeches. They were thrilled to see Apollonius because they were on the point of setting off to Ionia to visit him. Elsewhere Philostratus tells us about a group of youngsters from Ionia—all of Greece called them ‘the Apollonians’—who had bidden farewell to the study of eloquence and had applied themselves to Pythagoreanism ‘with an incredible enthusiasm’.²¹⁹

Of course, some young men had their doubts: thus the lad who was fond of subtle discussions (*μειράκιον θρασὺν περὶ τὰς ξρίδας*) and, after Apollonius’ death, felt dubious about the immortality of the soul, a problem he discussed with his friends day after day; but one day Apollonius appeared to him in a dream, and the doubting Thomas no longer had any doubts.²²⁰

Like Neopythagoreanism, Neoplatonism too was a genuine religion. The third-century philosopher Plotinus, who taught for many years in Rome, turned philosophy into a knowledge of the Godhead. Under his successors philosophy was increasingly shoved into the background to make way for magic, theurgy and thaumaturgy.²²¹

It is clear that, especially with the Syrian Iamblichus, Neoplatonism was turned into a sort of Eastern mystery religion.

This philosopher, as we know from Eunapius, exercised a sort of magnetic attraction on his pupils. They came from all over the world to follow him. He charmed his devotees by his conversation when they were dining together and showered them, as it were, with nectar. Eunapius relates one or two of the miracles that were ascribed to him. One day the adored philosopher was returning with his disciples from the daily religious ceremony. Suddenly he refused to follow the usual path because he had the ‘feeling’ that a corpse was being carried by. Some of his adherents followed him along an alternative route, while others—‘the greater number and the more obstinate’—remained where they were, ‘scenting like hounds for the proof’. Evidence was given soon, but some disciples still remained sceptical and looked for more decisive evidence of their teacher’s divine gifts. On a hot summer’s day they were all bathing together in the warm-water spa at Gadara in Syria. The pupils insisted on being shown a real miracle. Iamblichus decided to demonstrate his gifts. He knelt down, touched the water with his hand and pronounced a magic formula. From one of the springs Eros suddenly appeared, from another Anteros. Both boys embraced Iamblichus as if he were their father. The disciples were dumbfounded. All their doubts were now dispelled and they attached themselves to their teacher ‘as though by an unbreakable chain’.²²²

The future Emperor Julian (‘the Apostate’) also came under Neoplatonism’s spell. Between his fourteenth and his twentieth year (AD 345–51) he lived as a virtual exile at Macellum in the greatest possible seclusion. He had been given a strict Christian upbringing, but this religion failed to touch his mystical disposition since the Christians who surrounded him were anything but a good example. When, at age 19, he was finally able to leave his ‘prison’ and got permission to pursue his studies, he came in contact with Neoplatonist circles, where, as Libanius tells us, he found an answer to all his religious problems and an outlet for his mystical aspirations. According to Eunapius, in Pergamum this earnest youth (*ἐν μειρακίῳ πρεσβύτης*) yearned to become a disciple of Aedesius, himself a disciple of Iamblichus. Aedesius felt himself to be too old to initiate the future emperor in his doctrine and referred him to Eusebius, one of his pupils and a philosopher ‘of the old school’, who had a suspicious attitude towards wonder-working and magic. So Julian became for some time a pupil of Eusebius. One day this man related how the thaumaturge Maximus had once performed ‘wonders’ in a temple of Hecate: the goddess’s face became alive

and put on a smile, while a flame sprang up in the torches she held in her hands. Eusebius wanted to stigmatize such theatrical shenanigans but his words had the diametrically opposite effect. Julian had found the man he was looking for, dashed off to Athens, where he attached himself to Maximus, and, with wild enthusiasm, soaked himself in his teachings and in those of his kindred spirit Chrysanthius. Eunapius tells us that the two philosophers were just about able to satisfy his curiosity. Julian himself credited Maximus with the leading role in the formation of his character and expressed gratitude for the moderating influence he exerted on his silly ecstasies and extravagances. It was under his influence that he solemnly rejected Christianity and was initiated into the mysteries of Neoplatonism.²²³

As has been pointed out already, the borderline between philosophy and religion had become rather blurred, especially in later Neoplatonism. This philosophy had become a sort of mystery cult comparable to the cults of Cybele, Isis and Mithras—religions which held an increasing appeal for people from the early days of the Empire, in the East as well as in the West. These mystery cults were successful precisely because they appealed to the whole person, to intellect, feelings and imagination, because they answered the widespread desire for sanctification, redemption and liberation, and because they announced a belief in the afterlife.

In view of what has been said in the foregoing paragraphs, it must have been inevitable that these religions had a strong attraction for the young. Apuleius, for example, was probably quite typical. He relates how, both during his student days in Athens and on his numerous voyages at that time, he let himself be initiated into a large number of mystery cults. He carefully preserved all sorts of badges and souvenirs the priests had given him. What moved him to participate in all these ceremonies, he says, was his pursuit of truth and the awareness of his duty to the gods: *studium veri et officium erga deos*.²²⁴

Curiosity was also probably a motive. It was the main characteristic of Lucius, the leading character in Apuleius' novel *The Golden Ass*. Like many others, as a young man he was fascinated by magic,²²⁵ although it cost him dear when—as a result of his curiosity concerning witchcraft—he was changed into a donkey and got himself into all sorts of perilous situations. At the end of the novel, thanks to the intervention of the goddess Isis, the youth regained his human form. He deeply desired to be initiated

into her cult. By way of preparation, he was plunged in water and was forced to abstain from wine and meat for ten days. Only after this did the initiation, to which he refers in allusive terms, take place: 'I approached near unto hell, even to the gates of Proserpine, and after that I was ravished throughout all the elements, I returned to my proper place: about midnight I saw the sun brightly shine, I saw likewise the gods celestial and the gods infernal, before whom I presented myself and worshipped them.'²²⁶

POETRY²²⁷

Many youths are more than able to develop a taste for art and to produce some of their own. This is most apparent in the field of poetry. In this section I shall investigate the principal characteristics of youth poetry: poetry as the expression of youthful feelings, as an intellectual game, as the manifestation of a longing for a better world. First, however, I shall deal with the poetry read by the young and with the role played by young people in the evolution of literature.

Poetry for young readers²²⁸

In the young man's aesthetic sensibilities, poetry seems to have had a privileged place. This fact emerges clearly from a passage in which Seneca discusses *sententiae*, which were, as we have already seen,²²⁹ especially admired by youth: 'The very same words are more carelessly received and make less impression upon us, when they are spoken in prose; but when metre is added and when regular prosody has compressed a noble idea, then the selfsame thought comes, as it were, hurtling with a fuller fling.'²³⁰

Poetry occupied an indispensable place in ancient education. It was the principal subject taught by the grammarian, and the *rhetor* too often included poetry in his programme of instruction. The educational value of such poets as Ennius, Terence (not Plautus) or Virgil was questioned by almost no one. There was more reticence where an endorsement of the 'lighter' genres was concerned.²³¹ Quintilian, for example, believed that elegies, Horace and comic poetry were ill suited to children and ought only be read once the pupils had sufficient mental maturity and moral sense: *certe ad firminus aetatis robur reserventur...cum mores in tuto fuerint*.²³² Plutarch, for his part, wrote an entire tract devoted exclusively to

the subject of the way a young man should study poetry. The author felt that this art was full of hidden dangers for young readers. And yet he believed it was impossible to forbid the young to become acquainted with it and that this was not even desirable because poetry rendered the task of learning light and agreeable. This art contains a number of ideas which can mislead or confuse a young reader, yet there is also much which is useful and instructive. Careful supervision is a necessity. If a youth receives proper guidance, if he is taught to use his intelligence and his critical faculties when reading, if he knows how to recognize and ignore the false, misleading and fabulous, and if, in immoral passages, he is not deluded into approving vicious sentiments because of their artistic presentation, then poetry can make an important and positive contribution to his character development and is an appropriate preparation not only—as Quintilian believed—for the art of eloquence but also for philosophy.²³³

During school hours as well as after school, many youths read literature on their own initiative with considerable enthusiasm: usually prose as well as poetry, sometimes chiefly poetry.

There is a nice illustration of such interest from a relatively early stage in Roman history. After his victory over the Macedonian king Perseus in 168 BC, Paullus Aemilius allowed his sons—who were very fond of literature (*φιλογραμματοῦσι τοῖς υἱέσιν*) to ship the vast library of the king to Rome. One of these sons was the later Scipio Aemilianus Africanus, who was then aged 17. Thanks to this library, he, and doubtless many other youngsters, came into direct contact with the masterpieces of Greek literature, which he avidly studied with his teacher and ‘ideal’ Polybius.²³⁴

A couple of generations later, Ovid provides us with an example of a youth who really was obsessed with poetry. Just as a few decades earlier the young Cicero went along to listen to as many orators as he could,²³⁵ the young Ovid was to be found wherever there was a poet reading his work. In his autobiography he gives an imposing list of poets who were active when he was a youth: ‘The poets of that time I fondly revered: all bards I thought so many present gods.... And as I revered older poets so was I revered by the younger, for my Thalia [Muse] was not slow to become renowned.’²³⁶

During the Empire the poetic creativity of youth diminished. Yet even then there were still enthusiastic readers. The young Marcus Aurelius, for example, was an ‘omnivorous’ reader. In one of his

letters, written at the age of 22, he relates how, within the space of a couple of days, he read no fewer than sixty (!) volumes (prose as well as poetry) and had filled five notebooks with excerpts.²³⁷

In late antiquity, at a time when the level of general culture had sunk rather low, poetry continued to attract. This was even true in Christian circles, which usually did not require of a young man such a great sacrifice as the renunciation of poetry.²³⁸ A conflict could nevertheless arise between love of God and love of poetry when a young man strove to live the perfect life. This can be illustrated by youthful memories of John Cassian and Jerome.

Already at an early age John Cassian felt a vocation to a monastic life, but the profane education he had received did not cease teasing him: even when he was praying, singing psalms, or confessing his sins, some verse or other or the image of an hero flashed through his mind.²³⁹ Better known is the case of Jerome. As a youth his favourite authors were Cicero, Virgil, Plautus and Terence, and he had built up a wide library by copying out the works of these authors in his own hand, 'showing great industry and at the cost of blood, sweat and tears'. After withdrawing as a monk into the desert near Chalkis, he was still an avid devotee of secular literature. He had taken his library with him, for, as he himself writes, he could not live without it, and alternated between severe penitential exercises and reading Plautus and Cicero. But one day he had a dream. He is accused by the judge of being a devotee of Cicero rather than of Christ: *Ciceronianus es, non Christianus*. The bystanders ask forgiveness for 'the errors of his youth', yet he is only released once he has sworn not to concern himself any more with secular literature.²⁴⁰

The authors who won favour with the young clearly changed from one period to another. Terence and, above all, Virgil were, however, perennial favourites when it came to poetry, just as Sallust and Cicero were always the most popular prose writers. Given that these authors were always in demand, it can be stated as a generalization that the younger generation normally²⁴¹ had a preference for 'the moderns'—even when these were no school authors—while the older generation opted for ancient, 'established' values. As Horace writes, 'nearly all our elders (*patres*)...think nothing can be right save what has pleased them themselves, or because they hold it a shame to yield to their juniors (*minoribus*), and to confess in their old age (*senes*) that what they learned in beardless youth (*imberbes*) should be destroyed'.²⁴²

In Cicero's view, for example, the good old Ennius could not be beaten as a poet, and he took a very dim view of the young poets of his own day, whom he contemptuously described as 'singers in the style of [the obscure] Euphorion' (*cantores Euphorionis*).²⁴³ The younger people, on the other hand, could not stomach old-fashioned verses from such poets as Ennius, while they were in raptures about the sophisticated art of their contemporaries and were—like Catullus—quite unconcerned about what the 'old and severe men' (*senes severiores*)²⁴⁴ thought of their art and life-style. Ovid too was not writing for old-fashioned Romans, who accused him of depravity (*nequitia*) and got annoyed by his frivolous poetry. There is for them no obligation to read his verses! He had his steady clientèle:

For my readers I want the maid not cold (*non frigida virgo*) at the sight of her promised lover's face, and the untaught boy (*rudis puer*) touched by passion till now unknown; and let some youth (*iuvenis*) who is wounded by the same bow as I am now, know in my lines the record of his own heart's flame, and, long wondering, say: 'From what tattler has this poet learned, that he has put in verse my own mishaps?'²⁴⁵

There could be various reasons why poetry was popular with youth.²⁴⁶ For some, poetry was read virtually exclusively for the sake of eloquence: by reading the poets they hoped to extend their vocabulary and improve their style.²⁴⁷ For others, wide reading of poetry as well as prose was the result of their thirst for knowledge.²⁴⁸ There were yet others who, consciously or unconsciously, looked for an ideal on which to model themselves. This aspect appears clearly in a testimony by Julian. At the age of 23 he received a whole library—books of philosophers, historians, orators, poets—from the Empress Eusebia, who knew his insatiable hunger for reading. There were so many books that, as he writes himself, 'even my desire for them was satisfied, though I am altogether insatiable of converse with literature'. To these gifts he applied himself 'incessantly whenever he had leisure'. Books, Julian continues, can provide young people with more understanding, judgement and experience than belongs to most older men. 'Moreover, in my opinion, there is in such books a means of liberal education for the character, supposing that one understands how, like a craftsman, setting before himself as patterns the noblest men

and words and deeds, to mould his own character to match them, and make his words resemble theirs.²⁴⁹

A young man, like a child, was certainly fascinated by 'a good story', but, more than was the case with a child, he was seduced by the charm of a well-turned phrase, by the melody and rhythm of a beautiful verse.²⁵⁰ It is, furthermore, clear that he was attracted by feeling, pathos and the romantic, as is nicely illustrated by a passage from Augustine:

I was captivated by theatrical shows. They were full of representations of my own miseries and fuelled my fire.... But at that time at the theatres I shared the joy of lovers when they wickedly found delight in each other, even though their actions in the spectacle on the stage were imaginary; when, moreover, they lost each other, I shared their sadness by a feeling of compassion.... At that time, poor thing that I was, I loved to suffer and sought out occasions for suffering. So when an actor on stage gave a fictional imitation of someone else's misfortunes, I was the more pleased; and the more vehement the attraction for me, the more the actor compelled my tears to flow.... Hence came my love for sufferings, but not a kind that pierced me very deeply; for my longing was not to experience myself miseries such as I saw on stage. I wanted only to hear stories and imaginary legends of sufferings which, as it were, scratched me on the surface.²⁵¹

Poetry by young authors²⁵²

Virtually every pupil who had passed through the grammarian's hands had mastered the technique of writing poetry, an 'ability' which was all the rage in the early days of the Empire. Such dilettantism could find no favour in the eyes of Horace: 'The fickle public has changed its taste and is fired throughout with a scribbling craze (*scribendi studio*); sons and grave sires (*pueri patresque severi*) sup crowned with leaves and dictate their lines.'²⁵³ In another passage the same author inveighs against the 'arty type', poets who believe that one has to be possessed of some sort of madness in order to be able to compose poems: 'a goodly number [of poets] take no pains to pare their nails or to shave their beards; they haunt lonely places and shun the baths—for surely one will win the esteem and name of poet if he never entrusts to the barber

Licinus his head'.²⁵⁴ Even though Horace does not mention the age of this kind of artist, there can be no doubt that he is thinking principally of young people.

There were certainly young men so totally devoid of talent that they never made a name for themselves as poets, however much they may have wanted to. Others, however, were talented and managed to make an impact on literature. They were not rare, especially during the late Republic and early Empire with the appearance of the *poetae novi*, primarily Catullus (77?-47? BC)—in Schanz-Hosius's view a group of 'young hotheads'²⁵⁵—and the elegiac poets Cornelius Gallus (c. 69–26 BC), Propertius (c. 47–15 BC), Tibullus (c. 48–19 BC), Ovid (43 BC–AD 17). Living more than a century - earlier the comedian Terence (185?-159 BC)—who probably died at the age of 25—and possibly the satirist Lucilius (148?-102 BC)²⁵⁶ too, deserve mention, while under the early Empire the satirist Persius (who died AD 62, at the age of 28) and the epic poet Lucan (who committed suicide AD 65, aged 26) were active.

It is not always possible to determine at what age these—and many other—young poets became conscious of their poetic gifts. We have concrete information in the cases of Catullus and Propertius. As Catullus writes, 'At the time when first a white dress was given to me, when my youth in its flower was keeping jocund spring-time, I wrote merry poems enough; not unknown am I to the goddess who mingles with her cares a sweet bitterness.'²⁵⁷ And in one of his elegies Horus tells Propertius: 'When the golden locket [the *bulla*] was removed from your innocent neck and you donned the toga of manhood (*libera toga*) before your mother's gods, then Apollo dictates a little of his song to you and forbids you to bawl forth speeches in the bedlam of the law-courts (*insanum forum*). Now you must compose Elegy.'²⁵⁸

It is probably no accident that both Catullus and Propertius made their mark at the time they took the male toga, i.e. soon after puberty. It was at about the same age that Ovid too discovered his vocation as a poet: 'To me even as a boy service of the divine gave delight and stealthily the Muse was ever drawing me aside to do her work.' His father was deeply opposed to this passion of his son's and did not see profit in a life as artist: 'Even Homer left no wealth.' The young Ovid wished to submit in filial obedience and, following in his brother's footsteps, tried to apply himself to eloquence, yet his *ingenium* prevented him from doing so: 'I tried to write words freed from rhythm, yet all unbidden song would come

upon befitting numbers, and whatever I tried to write was verse.’ For a time he hesitated between a senatorial career and his vocation to poetry, but then he decided to follow the prompting of his heart. ‘[Politics] was a burden too great for my powers. I had neither a body to endure the toil nor a mind suited to it; by nature I shunned the worries of an ambitious life and the Aeonian’s sisters [the Muses] were ever urging me to seek the security of a retirement I had ever chosen and loved.’ His first collection of poetry was the *Amores*, in which he sang the praises of his beloved Corinna. His beard having been cut ‘but once or twice’, one assumes at about 18, he made his first public appearance as a poet.²⁵⁹

For many youngsters poetry must have been a real passion. A good example is Licentius, the 17-year-old friend and pupil of Augustine. While they were preparing for baptism at Cassiacum, a good deal of time was devoted to reading Virgil and to philosophical discussions. All pupils were deeply interested in philosophy, but suddenly Licentius plunged himself into poetry. It was now his dream to become a famous poet, to reach the top of the Helicon, to be swept up into the celestial spheres! He was at once totally absorbed by the composition of a (romantic) poem on Pyramus and Thisbe; he could not bear to be disturbed, and was incapable of mustering interest for anything other. His thoughts were constantly concerned with his heroes, he was ever looking for inspiration, left his food and drink untouched, slipped away from table so as to continue working. One day his teacher, Augustine, came upon him, mouth wide open reciting verse. Even in the small hours of the night the muse continued to haunt him. One particular night Augustine had difficulty in falling asleep. He wanted to start a philosophical discussion but received a somewhat gruff answer from his pupil. ‘Leave me in peace, I have other things to occupy me.’ The future Church Father felt it was time to take a firm line: he certainly admired Licentius’ poetic talent, he said, and esteemed him as a fully fledged poet, yet he felt it essential to curb this passion, which threatened to create a wall between his talented pupil and philosophy. Licentius was disconcerted by his idol’s rebuke, suddenly perceived that philosophy was much more important than poetry, and resolved to turn his back on this trivial occupation to devote himself to the pursuit of truth. Augustine advised his young friend not to abandon poetry entirely- and suggested that he finish off his poem, concluding the story on a moralizing note by highlighting the scandalous nature of Pyramus’ and Thisbe’s love

and singing the praises of the ‘true love’ which is philosophy, i.e. Christianity. Indeed, it was Augustine’s—and Plutarch’s²⁶⁰—belief that poetry pursued with moderation could provide a most suitable preparation for philosophy (and religion). And, apart from that, Licentius had been bitten so hard by the poetic bug that only total saturation could cure him of his passion.²⁶¹

Characteristics of youthful poetry²⁶²

It is clear that poetry exercised a great power of attraction over the young. In some cases, it was only a fad, yet for some youngsters there was question of a veritable ‘vocation’. There were many youths who combined poetry with eloquence, but some turned their backs (more-or-less) totally on eloquence to devote themselves exclusively to poetry.

It is the purpose of this section to investigate ‘typical’ youthful poetry. Commonsense suggests that a young man should express himself differently from a child, an adult or an old man. Nonetheless, an analysis of poetry in relation to age is not a simple task. Age is only one of the many factors which determine someone’s style. Other important determinants are character, disposition, literary convention, social pressure, etc. Furthermore, ‘youth’ is a relatively imprecise concept. One can be ‘young’ in several different ways, one can be (like Lucilius?) old in years but young in heart—and in expression—while the converse is also possible. Despite these and other difficulties (the uncertainty concerning the chronology of life and work, about the literary value of a poet or poem), I think it is possible to identify some basic characteristics of youthful poetry: poetry as an articulation of the young man’s feelings, as a *jeu d’esprit*, and poetry as an expression of a longing for a better world.

*Poetry as the expression of one’s feelings*²⁶³

Poetry and sincerity²⁶⁴

Important in this context is the problem of credibility, the—complicated—question of whether (youthful) poets write in a way which is true to their life. According to some modern critics (e.g. A.W.Allen, F.Cairns, P.Veyne), who react against the biographical methodology applied until some decades ago to the Roman poets, no

biographical conclusions can be drawn about the poet from his own work. The author's feelings are completely irrelevant to the poetic product, sincerity is a function of style, not of personality.²⁶⁵

Nowadays everybody agrees that the Roman poets of love were not historians. That does not mean, however, that they tell us nothing at all about their lives, their feelings, the world in which they were living. Such a dichotomy is most unlikely, for even the act of choosing a mask tells us something about the poet. As N. Rudd writes, 'no doubt it [sincerity] *was* a function of style, but Allen has omitted to add that Cicero, Horace, and Quintilian all agreed that the best way to make one's style emotionally persuasive was to feel the emotions oneself.... There must be some relation, however obscure, between technique and personality.'²⁶⁶

Still other considerations are possible. Fantasy and real-life experience are not necessarily mutually contradictory. Fiction, of course, can be based on facts; imagination can be a means to find and express oneself, or at least to express the experiences and feelings of the character described—a character which cannot be wholly other-worldly, which must be recognizable to the audience.²⁶⁷ Besides, the ancients had no problems with the use of conventional language and/or traditional themes, and artistic sophistication did—and does—not necessarily imply insincerity. Writing poetry involves wrestling with language, and it is often the case that a poet has to work long and hard at a piece of verse before he can express himself precisely—or nearly precisely—as he wishes. *Ars est celare artem*: it is true art to conceal art. 'Art' is needed to get a poem's message across, to get the spark of poetic inspiration through to the reader. It is perfectly possible (and even probable) that Catullus, generally viewed as the most spontaneous Latin poet, may not have dashed off his verse without blotting a line, yet, as C.Segal claims,

the search for artistry and intellectual structure should not blind us to the real intensity which pervades these poems. Conversely, we must not forget (as contemporary critics seem in no danger of forgetting) that it is only through their formal perfection and artistic control that these poems are able to transcend the privacy of passion.... Yet, while intensity of emotion needs art to realize itself as expression and thus affect us meaningfully, the presence of art does not in all poets exclude the possibility of real emotion over real

experiences.... A poet like Catullus is driven to 'solve' such [linguistic and poetic] problems because he has lived and felt something which he needs to define, explore, and hold through form. It is precisely Catullus' extraordinary intensity of feeling which moves him to a corresponding intensity of form.²⁶⁸

Individual poets²⁶⁹

The first young poet in Roman literature is the comedian Terence. The difference between him and his older colleague Plautus is considerable, and, in some measure at least, this has to do with his youthful age and the influence of his young protectors and friends, especially the Younger Scipio. The six comedies he wrote are characterized by tenderness and humanity (*humanitas*), a typical Roman value which first emerged in his work. In more than one respect he can be called a revolutionary, someone questioning traditional values, such as the relationship between fathers and children, education, marriage, love, women, slaves, youth, old age.²⁷⁰

It is generally assumed that the individual in poetry²⁷¹ was only freed from the pressure of community at a relatively late stage under the impulse of the *poetae novi*, especially Catullus,²⁷² the only poet of this 'school' of whom we can form a clear picture, and who is generally viewed as the most emotional, subjective and romantic of all Roman poets, as the precursor in some sense of the modern *Erlebnisdichtung*.²⁷³ He was probably the first Roman who found it worthwhile to transform his own feelings and experiences into art. His entire poetic corpus is centred on his own ego, his relationship with others, his loved one, his friends or his enemies. He is the poet *par excellence* of strong, turbulent feelings, of love and hate, of joy and pain, of hope and despair. In his poetry he comes face to face with the often hostile outside world, tries to reach clarity in his inner self, and lays his most intimate feelings bare.

Modern critics increasingly stress the unity of Catullus' work and deny that he was sometimes *Naturbursch* (in his shorter poems, *carmina* 1–60, 69–116) and on other occasions a poet of the school (in his longer poems, *carmina* 61–8). The verses of the first class were not all written at one go; they were intended from the beginning as artistic creations, even when Catullus speaks of his poems as *nugae* ('trifles') and of his art as *ludere* (play).²⁷⁴ Even in

these short, 'lyrical' poems, as H.A.Khan writes, 'we do not have any naive, untutored minstrel, but rather a poet in full artistic control'.²⁷⁵ The longer poems, on the other hand, are more than just exercises in technical virtuosity: they too are quite lyrical,²⁷⁶ interpret his own intimate feelings and longings and, as J.Granarolo claims, are 'the poet's mask'.²⁷⁷ From his nuptial songs (*carmina* 61, 62) and his poem on the lock of Berenice (*carmen* 66) it is obvious that the young poet is dreaming of a lasting relationship with his beloved. In *carmen* 68 one recognizes his Lesbia in Laodamia, who is passionately in love with her husband Protesilaus. Attis (*carmen* 63), the youth who emasculated himself out of love for Cybele, is described by him so well because the poet could identify with this young man so infatuated with love for his goddess. The *furor* which seized Attis had overwhelmed him too in his love for Lesbia; fanatical idolization and despairing disillusion were marks of his own estate. In his famous short epic about Peleus and Thetis (*carmen* 64), finally, Catullus depicts the love between a mortal and a goddess, thus projecting his own love for Lesbia on to a more exalted plain. This poem digresses on the story of Ariadne and Theseus, and here too Catullus is writing about himself: in Ariadne's complaints we hear the unhappy poet himself, the faithless Theseus is a reference to the perfidious Lesbia.²⁷⁸

In *all* his poems, the long and the short, Catullus is a conscious artist as well as a lyrical poet. It is important to note in this context that his technique is at the service of the content, wells up as it were from his heart and betrays his turbulent emotions. Figures of speech such as diminutives, superlatives, hyperboles, litotes, colloquialisms, anaphora, questions, hyperbata, and especially repetitions—all, as has been convincingly demonstrated by H. Bardon, help him to express himself, his *ego* (a word used not fewer than 240 times!), to articulate his anxieties, his restlessness, his obsessions, his fundamental loneliness.²⁷⁹ In this young poet, art and artist are one, his 'artistic conscience' (*Kunstgewissen*) is, as F.Stoessl puts it, also his 'life conscience' (*Lebensgewissen*).²⁸⁰

Following hard upon the heels of the *poetae novi* came the elegiac poets,²⁸¹ Cornelius Gallus (of whose work hardly anything remains), Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid. Even though for them literary convention most probably played a more important role than for Catullus, their poems too convey a youthful feeling. In their love-elegies they express their own feelings—something which finds no parallel in Greek elegiac poetry.²⁸²

Propertius²⁸³ is mostly considered as the poet of disappointed love, a poet capable of deep feeling and imagination. His 'romantic' poetry has been described by G. Luck as 'an adolescent's day-dream—gay and sad, frivolous and tragic'.²⁸⁴ His bombastic, 'Asiatic' style mirrors his turbulent inner life; his abrupt, illogical leapfrogging from idea to idea is viewed by E. Reiuenstein as the result of his own confused emotions.²⁸⁵ The countless mythological allusions which make his poems difficult to understand are symptomatic of his assumed pose as *poeta doctus*, yet they also help him to articulate his innermost feelings and are, as is the case with Catullus, an expression of the need he felt to raise his love for Cynthia to a higher plane.²⁸⁶

Tibullus,²⁸⁷ too, is a fascinating poet, although of a very different type. Remarkable is 'his discreet style of writing, the purity of his diction, the straightforwardness of his syntax, the directness of his comparisons'.²⁸⁸ His entire work, G. Luck writes, is imbued with 'the freshness, the melancholy, the wonder and curiosity of youth'.²⁸⁹ In essence, he is a melancholy dreamer,²⁹⁰ someone who is turned in on himself and whose poetry describes, in an elegant Latin and without the pedantry of Alexandrian learning, his general mood rather than concrete reality. At first sight, he seems to be an uncomplicated poet, but his simplicity is misleading. He too, as is made clear by J. P. Elder, was a poet of firm and independent views who knew what he wanted to say and made no concessions to fashions in politics or art.²⁹¹ According to W. Wimmel, his art is an 'art of avoidance'.²⁹² Tibullus consciously avoided writing as others did. Hence his rejection of mythology, his dealing with pederasty, the introduction of bucolic elements in his elegies.

Ovid²⁹³ is generally seen as the least personal and sincere of the elegiac poets. His *Amores* were written from about his eighteenth year on and brought him celebrity. His beloved Corinna might not be a 'real' girl but a figure of his own invention, the epitome of many women. To use the words of L. P. Wilkinson, 'as a youth at Rome he fell in love with a woman named, not Corinna, but Elegeia'.²⁹⁴ For Ovid, love is not so much a tragic passion as an enchanting, magical game. The poet distances himself from his subject; he is always on the side of the intellect, and handles his material with a solid dose of humour, in a fashion one would expect rather from an adult than from a youth.

It is probably necessary to qualify this widely accepted view on Ovid. Perhaps, as some scholars claim, his *Amores* reflect personal

experience to a higher degree than is generally admitted.²⁹⁵ In any case, this poet was certainly *not* the insensitive libertine he is regularly taken for.²⁹⁶ He removed the tragic element from love, made it more tender, gallant, frivolous and playful, and freed it from all its crudity and brutality. More than any other poet in antiquity, he demonstrated a capacity for putting himself in a woman's shoes, for understanding her feelings and seeing the world from her point of view. Moreover, he stresses in both the *Amores* and the *Ars amatoria* that both male and female should derive equal pleasure from love. Men and women are equally entitled to equal satisfaction; the mere animal union of two bodies, excluding any mutual affection, is rejected.²⁹⁷

There is perhaps more. The impersonal tone of the *Amores* may perhaps be ascribed to the fact that only a second, revised version has come down to us. It would not be a surprise that the 'more mature', 40-year-old or so poet should put behind him 'immature' poems of which he was ashamed or rewrite them in a more objective, 'mature' style.²⁹⁸ It is possible that the differences between the young Ovid and other youthful poets of love were not so great and that his desire for a new art (*neues Kunstwollen*)²⁹⁹ that led him to posit love as a game, set in when he was older, not at the time he wrote the first edition of his *Amores*.

Contemporaries of Ovid were Horace and Virgil. Their youthful poems, too, are imbued with their personality. In the few poems of the *Catalepton* which are generally considered authentic (especially *carmen* 5), the personal commitment of the young Virgil is obvious. The influence of Catullus is evident, and Virgil's fresh, merry, witty, sometimes aggressive verses are for K. Vretska the proof that Virgil too once was really young.³⁰⁰ The lyrical character is also obvious in his *Bucolics*, written between the ages of 27 and 31 and considered by the poet himself as a work of youth.³⁰¹ Love is at the centre of these poems.³⁰² The poet is strongly influenced by his model, Theocritus, yet he produces a totally different sort of lyrical poetry. The strict frontiers between the inner and the exterior, between objective and subjective become fluid; his feelings permeate all his verse in a way which is absent from his later, 'mature' work.³⁰³

Horace too strikes a more personal and emotional note in his earlier work—his *Epodes* and *Saturae*, both written between the ages of 24 and 34—than at a later stage. The earliest poems from these collections are the articulation of the doubts which had got hold of him after the battle of Philippi (42 BC), in which he had

fought at the side of Brutus for republican ideals. They give vent, often in pretty earthy, sarcastic language, to his disillusionment and bitterness about the state of society, his revulsion at all the repulsive developments he detected at every turn. To borrow an expression from F.Klingner, these poems express the poet's refusal (*Abwehrstellung*) *vis à vis* the world which in his later work, partly as a consequence of his meeting with Maecenas in 38 BC, but largely as the fruit of inner growth, makes way for a greater mildness and a more cheerful outlook on the world around him.³⁰⁴

Let us end this survey with Persius and Lucan, two poets who were active in the first century AD. Persius is mostly regarded as a bookish, Utopian youth who bores his readers with the lessons of the Stoa delivered in an obscure language—a judgement which, as will be shown,³⁰⁵ is undoubtedly too severe. The greatest poetic genius of this age was Lucan, a productive poet whose poem on the civil war between Caesar and Pompey has survived. The whole epic—an objective genre by definition—is penetrated by the personality of this youth who was obliged by Nero to commit suicide when he was 26. The young poet constantly interposes himself in the story, again and again makes a stand and pours out his heart, his own feelings, his longing for freedom, his abhorrence of despotism. The subjective wins the upper hand over the objective, the irrational over the rational. Lucan lives and thinks in a world of extremes, is obsessed by the biggest and best, but also by all that is rare, horrid and repulsive. The world created by this *Stürmer und Dränger*³⁰⁶ is pathetic, romantic, disharmonious and full of paradoxes, his language full of exclamations and interjections. The poet is largely expressing himself in his work, and it is through this candour and involvement of self, as well as through the virtuosity of his rhetorical language, that this new, 'lyrical' approach to the epic succeeds and does not sound contrived.³⁰⁷

Youthful feelings³⁰⁸

Love and hatred occupied a central place in a young man's emotions. For the majority of young poets, love is their muse, the source of their inspiration, 'their' domain.³⁰⁹ Usually young poets describe—or at least pretend to describe—their own feelings. Catullus sings the praises of his Lesbia, Calvus of his Quintilia, Lygdamus of his Neaera, Propertius of his Cynthia, Tibullus of his

Delia (and Nemesis), Ovid of his Corinna. All give vent to their hope and despair, to their ecstasy and misery, to their jealousy and hate.

The experiences of youthful love (and friendship) will be discussed further elsewhere.³¹⁰ The hatred they were capable of feeling was just as extreme.³¹¹ We think of Lucilius (if he wrote at an early age), Furius Bibaculus, Horace, Virgil, Lucan, Claudian,³¹² but it is Catullus (again!) and Persius who typify the younger generation at its best.

In language which is crude, flippant and obscene, Catullus spits out his venom against everyone who gets on his nerves, whether they are rivals in love or literary activity, conservative Romans—the *Romuli nepotes*—or corrupt politicians. Nothing or nobody was spared, not even Cicero or Caesar,³¹⁴ even though the latter had power of life and death at that time. This young rebel³¹⁵ wants not only to ridicule his opponents but also to break their spirit and to destroy them; all means, subtle irony as well as crude mockery, are used to achieve this end. One can sense the pleasure this youngster felt at using obscenities, at exceeding the limits of good taste, and how he quite deliberately used a specialized vocabulary to provoke the establishment.³¹⁶

The young Stoic satirist Persius, too, has to be discussed in this context. The aggressive character of his first satire—a critique on the ‘modern’ poetry, whose corruption is shown to be inextricably linked to moral corruption—is generally accepted,³¹⁷ but for the rest he is mostly considered as a young man with the mentality—and seriousness—of old age. We have no doubt about Persius’ radical and extreme seriousness, but—as is evident from our chapter on philosophy—exactly this is typical of many youths. Persius really disliked a tyrannical emperor such as Nero, corrupt poetry, debauched morality, the oppression of freedom, religious hypocrisy. We can only agree with the words of P.Y.Forsyth that Persius ‘was inclined to “rock the boat” by satirizing a “sick society” badly in need of medication. From his position as an educated young man of means he castigated the Roman Establishment for its folly and ignorance, hoping thereby to point out the way to the virtuous life.’³¹⁸

Towards an adult poetry³¹⁹

It is quite normal that a poet should write differently as he grows older. This is clearly visible in the poetical ‘careers’ of Virgil

and Ovid.³²⁰ I shall discuss here only Propertius and Horace, who both reflect explicitly on this phenomenon.

With the advance of years Horace became aware of the fact that he was getting increasingly mild in character and losing the power to write lyrical poetry any longer. Thus at the age of about 56 he made up his mind and went over to writing his philosophically inspired *Epistles*: 'The years, as they pass, plunder us of all joys, one by one. They have stripped me of mirth, love, feasting, play; they are striving to wrest from me my poems (*tendunt extorquere poemata*). What would you have me do?'; 'In truth it is profitable to cast aside toys and to learn wisdom; to leave to lads the sport that fits their age (*tempestivum pueris concedere ludum*) and not to search out words that will fit the music of the Latin lyre, but to master the rhythms and measures of a genuine life.'³²¹

That lyric poetry was a young man's forte emerges clearly from the *oeuvre* of Propertius.³²² He launched his career with a book about Cynthia, the *Monobiblos*, which made him so famous that Maecenas took this youth, probably not yet 20 years old, into his circle. Augustus' 'cultural affairs minister' did not ask him to wave goodbye to love-poetry but did insist that he should also write poems of a more epic nature, which would glorify Rome. Propertius replied that Cynthia was his only source of inspiration, asked to be allowed to shine in the genre in which he excelled, and claimed that he lacked the mental power to write epic poetry. At some point, however, he seems to have given in to the pressure of his patron:

Now 'tis time to beat the bounds of Helicon with other dances,
'tis time to give the field to the Thessalian steed. Now am I
minded to celebrate the squadrons valiant for battle and tell
of the Roman camp of my leader. And should strength fail me,
my daring at least shall win me praise: in mighty projects even
to have wished is enough. Let a poet's first years sing of love,
his last of conflicts: henceforth I will sing of wars, since my
girl's praises have been penned.³²³

But Propertius still always lacked power, and it would still take some time before, in a fourth book of elegies, he wrote of Roman sagas, feasts and customs.³²⁴

This move from lyrical to epic is, as is stressed by J.-P. Boucher, not so much the consequence of literary convention—the influence of Callimachus—or a capitulation to the established order as the

result of a natural process of maturation and of the poet's sincere conviction that a poet has to follow his *ingenium*: 'If the Roman and patriotic elements are more marked here, then this is due to both Propertius' and the regime's age. Propertius, *vir* and no longer *adulescens*, attaches more importance to the *respublica*, and around 15 BC the balance of the princeps' action is mostly positive'.³²⁵

*Poetry as an intellectual game*³²⁶

In his remarkable book *Homo Ludens*, J. Huizinga considers poetry fundamentally a game.³²⁷ This observation is given substance by the fact that, especially where the 'lighter' genres were concerned, the Ancients used the verb *ludere* to refer to writing poetry.³²⁸ Poetry is for them 'only' a game, but this does not exclude the game's being played in deadly earnest.

Huizinga distinguishes various sorts of 'games' and sees poetry among other things as a game of ingenuity and skill. This aspect of poetry made it attractive to many a young Roman. As in other domains (e.g. philosophy), he also aimed to shine in writing poetry and acquire for himself the epithet *poeta doctus*. This ambition explains how the poetry produced by some of the young tended to be obscure, complex and over-cerebral.

The *poetae novi*, mostly clever young men, rated erudition highly. Especially in their longer poems, they quite deliberately set about producing an arcane art-form, not directly accessible to one and all. They modelled themselves on the Alexandrians, especially on the obscure Euphorion, searched for the less wellknown myths, enjoyed using complex metre and complicated vocabulary, were meticulous in their attention to language and style, and peppered their poems with as many erudite geographical, historical and mythological allusions as possible. Young Cinna gives us an idea of the amount of hard work these poets put into their artistic products. In one of his poems, Catullus is enthusiastic about his friend's *Zmyrna*, a short epic poem now lost, in which the unnatural love of Myrrha for her father Cinyras is described. Although this poem was not very long (at most 600 verses), the poet put nine years' work into it. Even to the Ancients the final result was so downright obscure and recondite that it quickly needed a commentary.³²⁹

The *poetae novi* were not the only young poets who produced esoteric poetry. The same can be said of the young Propertius,

Virgil and Persius. Propertius is in many respects one of the most enigmatic poets in Latin literature. It is J.-P.Boucher's conviction that his very originality lay in his deliberate creation of a difficult art.³³⁰ The poet avoids what is concrete or specific, piles allusion upon allusion, uses risky images and extravagant vocabulary. His syntax is tortuous, his composition complex, his changes of mood and idea abrupt. It is clear that, come what may, he wants to avoid anything that sounds banal, and writes in a sort of code only accessible to a select few. The characterization L.A.Mackay gives of this 'Umbrian Rimbaud' fits in well with this expose:

Propertius has an eagerness, incoherence, and self-betrayal that seem characteristic of adolescence; as for pedantry, that can occur at any age, but there is an innocently enthusiastic pedantry in youth, quite different from the tired pedantry of old or middle age; Propertius' revelling in myth, sometimes far-fetched, is precisely what one would expect of a gifted youngster glowing in the excitement of first contact with the riches of Greek mythology. This impatient incoherence, this gratuitous obscurity, this ostentatious and not always very relevant erudition, are eminently consonant with youthful genius, and the occasional clumsiness of expression, the strains imposed on syntax and on metre, the pronominal padding, the ineffective imitation of effective lives, may point in the same direction.³³¹

The poetry produced by Virgil in his *Bucolics* is also no easy poetry. Like Propertius and the *poetae novi*, he deliberately tries to shroud in obscurity the deeper meaning of his poems. One can only support the view of W.Berg that 'the separateness from societal obligations especially favoured the sort of modernity through which young poets often seek to assert their novelty and individuality. Such poetry is, in the words of J.V.Cunningham, "obscure, and its obscurities are largely calculated; it is intended to be impenetrable to the vulgar. More than this, it is intended to exasperate them"'.³³²

Of all the Latin poets, the young satirist Persius is probably the most enigmatic.³³³ He does not wish to be understood in the traditional manner and by the common people. His 'shrouding of thoughts' is almost a byword. He constantly challenges his readers' intelligence by keeping them on his toes with his abrupt mental leaps, his strained diction, his *recherché* paradoxes, his extreme

brevity of expression, his avoidance of the concrete, his obscure allusions, his daring and far-fetched metaphors. Persius was certainly no scatterbrain; in fact he made every effort to produce a kind of secret language, appealing only to an elite audience. To use the words of M. Morford, 'his [obscure] poetry is that of a master who deliberately wrote as he did'.³³⁴ Persius could have been a model pupil of the teacher described by Quintilian who instructed his pupils to make all they said obscure and who was only satisfied if even he could not understand them.³³⁵

*Poetry as expression of youthful ambition,
originality and idealism*³³⁶

For some young men poetry was more than just an outlet for their feelings or an intellectual game. It was also a means of self-affirmation—they were longing for eternal fame³³⁷—and of showing off one's originality.

From the foregoing it will be clear that it was usually the young who were in the forefront of literary evolution. They were mostly progressive, did not want to walk on well-worn paths, but desired rather to search for a way of their own and refused to shut themselves in a respectable past by which they felt inhibited. Rather than explore this particular dimension of poetry, by way of rounding off this chapter an attempt will be made to show that young people's art could be an expression of their longing for a better world.³³⁸ This can be said of young poets during the late Republic, and was also true of youthful poets like Persius and Lucan who lived in the first century AD.

At first a few words about the latter. As has been said already, the satirist Persius was quite withering and would not hear of any compromise in his criticism of all forms of corruption in society, of calumny, superficiality, misplaced religiosity, inconsistency. He rejects a corrupt society because he does not accept its rules. J. Bayet (like R. Pichon) sees in him 'a young puritan preacher', 'who expresses himself with the raw brutality of an absolutely pure youth who vividly pictures to himself the ugliness of sin'.³³⁹ This youthful 'convert' to philosophy³⁴⁰ was uncompromising and humourless, 'possessed, even obsessed, with the need of being earnest'.³⁴¹ He believed in the message of the Stoa and wished to see its ideology implemented in society. To characterize him with the

words of P.Y.Forsyth, 'for Persius, as for many "young doctrinaires", there could be only one "right side"'.³⁴²

Lucan's epic poetry too is an expression of disillusionment with contemporary society. What he produced was decidedly 'engaged literature';³⁴³ he was 'the poet of spiritual resistance'.³⁴⁴ From beginning to end of *The Civil War* one can detect mounting hatred for the Emperor Nero and the principate. This young man saw the corruption of his own day as a direct consequence of Caesar's victory over Pompey in the battle of Philippi (42 BC): generosity came off the worse, wickedness triumphed. Lucan was a fanatical admirer of republican Rome, where the principles of 'liberty' and 'justice' were respected; he had nothing but contempt for a monarchy which curtailed freedom and reduced people to slavery. The traditional gods are absent from his epic, and he turned his anger on them because they permitted injustice to prevail and were clearly too weak to do anything about it. It was completely consistent with the views expressed in his work that he should get himself involved in Piso's conspiracy and ultimately be driven to suicide.

Let us go back a few decades in history. The late Republic was a typical era of revolution, of civil wars, murders, confiscations, all kind of horrors. It left its trace on the youth of the day. This fact will emerge from the juvenile poetry of the so-called Golden Age of Latin Literature (87 BC-AD 14), written by the *poetae novi*, (especially Catullus) and the elegiac poets (especially Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid) who radically broke with the *mos maiorum*, the manners and customs of the ancestors, so sacred to the Romans. In a sense they constitute what present-day social historians would call a 'counter-culture', a movement which seeks to 'discover new types of community, new family patterns, new sexual mores, new kinds of livelihood, new aesthetic forms, new personal identities on the far side of power politics'.³⁴⁵

In order to understand what was revolutionary in the attitude of the young writers of the period, it is essential to consider what their elders expected of them. They hoped that the younger generation would be their mirror-image, would remain faithful to traditional Roman values, and would prepare themselves for their future role as citizens and politicians, by service in the army and by pleading cases in the forum.

In his *Pro Sestio* (56 BC), Cicero called upon youth to defend the republic. Their only concern should be to win the esteem of virtuous citizens; they should not be discouraged by the setbacks the

virtuous have to endure; they ought to be concerned only about virtue and dignity, they should resist pleasure, indolence and idleness; they should be prepared to take maximum trouble and to brave enmities for the good of the state. A great sacrifice is required, but authentic fame can only be acquired by committing oneself to a grandiose and just cause.³⁴⁶

Cicero tried to mobilize youth in his struggle for the preservation and reform of the *respublica*. As we have seen, he was relatively successful,³⁴⁷ but not without encountering quite a number of setbacks. His ideal of the 'earnest man' (*vir gravis*) was severely contested by some youthful poets of his day.

The *poetae novi* were, without doubt, just as scandalized as Cicero, and possibly even more so, by the degenerate character of society at the time, yet they refused to work for the good of the community. For them the most important thing was *otium*, leisure, free time. They raised to a virtue what for 'respectable citizens' was considered a vice; they were proud of their vices, of their listlessness, their languor, their sheer laziness. They used the jargon of young people who deliberately wanted to shock by their 'apologia of vices'.³⁴⁸ In a community where especially action, fame, honour, wealth and prestige were held in high esteem, they refused to serve the commonwealth. Public life, with its scandals, corruption, intrigue and cruelty, filled them with revulsion or else inspired them, as was the case with Catullus, to candid mockery.³⁴⁹ They certainly wanted to possess money so as to live in a carefree fashion, yet there was no question of working for it. Their birth destined them for a career in politics or the army, yet fame on the battlefield or, as Propertius puts it, in 'the crazy forum (*insanum forum*)', was not appealing to them and was something they gladly relinquished to others.³⁵⁰ In their eyes only the poet would achieve everlasting fame.

Up to now only the negative aspects of the juvenile poets' 'programme' have been focused upon—their social criticism which was a reaction to the atrocities of the civil war and grew out of disillusionment with a degenerate society. Yet their attitude to life was not entirely negative.³⁵¹

These poets were anxious to teach contemporary youth a new life-style, and called upon them to withdraw from society and create a world with its own norms and standards, a world separate from that of the adults. Catullus was the first Latin author to see the years of youth as being valuable in themselves. The elegiac poets followed in

his footsteps. For the traditional Roman, one's youth was a period one should grow out of as quickly as possible, so that one could acquire the dignity consequent upon riper years as soon as one could. Catullus and kindred spirits found one's youth worth living for its own sake, considered it the best period of life, and shivered at the thought of getting old.

Their service to the emancipation of the individual was considerable, for traditionally in Rome the individual had to lose himself with a view to serving the community. For these young Romans of the late Republic, society meant nothing, while their own selves, their circle of friends and their beloved meant everything. They wanted to live their own lives freely and without outside pressure, and they did not worry what 'respectable citizens' or 'severe old men'³⁵² thought of them. They made a break with the severity and seriousness of the traditional Roman, valued mockery, play and fun, shunned all forms of barbarity, and argued—in a society all too pragmatic in its way of living—for the autonomy and primacy of the spirit.

These poets conferred a new dimension on all values. Central to their vision of life were love and the art of poetry, both intimately linked with a longing for peace.

The dyed-in-the-wool Roman was suspicious of poetry. This was to change completely with the *poetae novi* and the elegiac poets.³⁵³ For them poetry—hand in hand with love—was the centre of their lives, their life-task and their source of fulfilment. They were totally absorbed by their literary creativity, and got the greatest pleasure out of discussions concerning literary problems, out of reciting their own work or listening to that of others. The poetry they wrote was not the 'edifying' art the traditional Roman expected, but rather a thoroughly refined artistic expression in which they readily exposed their own feelings.

The world of poetry was also the world of love for these youngsters.³⁵⁴ The traditional Roman made a clear distinction between the sexual—an urge that simply had to be satisfied—and love, which was a threat to the rational in man and therefore had to be avoided. The vision articulated by the poets in question was in sharp contrast to this attitude. For them love was deadly serious, the highest and most beautiful expression of humanity, 'an unheard-of voyage for the soul'.³⁵⁵ The words which Propertius wrote to his beloved Cynthia must, in the ears of most of his contemporaries, have cried out to heaven: 'You are my only joy:

be I your only joy, Cynthia: this love means more to me than the name of father (*hic erit et patrio nomine pluris araor*).³⁵⁶

Here too Catullus again produced avant-garde work. He was doubtless incited by a strong sexual urge, but in his work love became more spiritual, refined and cultivated. The poet idealizes, divinizes his Lesbia, and casts himself as servant of his *domina*. His love is comparable to that of a father for his son; it is tender and soft, it is pure and based on fidelity (*fides*). The bonds of their love are as strong as those of a marriage, for their relationship is 'a sacred covenant of eternal friendship' (*aeternum hoc sanctae foedus amicitiae*).³⁵⁷ As E.Burck observes, 'Catullus and the Neoterics were the first to take love seriously in the sense that they recognized a life in love and for the beloved as a value to be added to the traditional norms of the private and public order, perhaps even superior to them'.³⁵⁸

As has been said, the opinions held by these youthful poets concerning poetry and love must be seen against the background of the prevailing social chaos. U.Knoche quite correctly sees their work as an expression of a desire for a better life, 'apart from the confusing events, even if it were unreal.... People wished to live as if it were worthwhile.... A dream-world became reality. And in poetry the Neoterics correspondingly built up an ambitious dream-world of Graeco-Roman character, from which the rawness of reality and its distastefulness were to be banished, and in which the experience of youth, friendship and love, of friends and companionship of pure poetic art and carefreeness were to be expressed'.³⁵⁹

Even the trivialities of a Catullus (or a Persius) can probably be explained as an articulation of a desire for a better world. They are, at least to a certain degree, an honest expression of indignation concerning the corrupt world outside, a rejection of all hypocrisy, an utterance as J.Granarolo has correctly emphasized, of personal integrity, of a desire for purity.³⁶⁰

In this context it is important briefly to point out the significance of mythology in the work of this 'angry young man', as he is called by A.D.Leeman.³⁶¹ For Catullus—as for Propertius—it offered a medium for expressing and ennobling his own feelings. These poets try to raise their experience above the plane of the individual and accidental, and to lend it a timeless, universal significance. For Catullus the myth was also an expression of his nostalgia for days of yore, for a paradisaical Golden Age, where he found his idealized vision of love, where the gods fraternized on the best of terms with

men and had not yet turned their backs on this world, where justice reigned, and where greed, war and violence were banished.³⁶²

The world of juvenile poets is the world of poetry and love. It can also be a world of peace.³⁶³ Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid could have had 'Make love, not war' as their motto. Tibullus curses those who first invented swords, praises the peace which makes people happy, mourns because the 'iron age' in which he lives does not honour love but is given over instead to greed, the origin of war and violence. Only in love does he feel himself a good commander and soldier: 'Standards and trumpets, distance yourselves from me, inflict wounds on the greedy men, provide them with riches too. Unconcerned by the supply I set aside, I will look down on the wealthy, and disdain hunger'.³⁶⁴

A similar 'pacifism' is characteristic of Propertius too: 'Peace has Love for its god, we lovers worship peace.'³⁶⁵ It was his conviction that only a life lived in authentic love can restrain man from civil wars and self-destruction. He resolutely refused to do his bit for Rome by getting married and fathering children: 'How should I furnish sons for our country's triumphs? No soldier shall ever be born of my blood (*nullus de nostro sanguine miles erit*). But if I were following the real camp, that of my mistress, then Castor's charger would not be grand enough for me. It is through service to her that renown has so glorified my name, renown that has travelled to the wintry northlands'.³⁶⁶

It goes without saying that in this turbulent period older Romans also longed for peace, yet it was probably the young who most intensely desired it. That desire for peace was sometimes linked with a desire to flee this world. This fact is clear in the youthful poems of Tibullus, Horace and Virgil.³⁶⁷

In his work Tibullus relapses into a dream-world. He dreamed of fleeing the world of his day so full of evil, so as to escape to the silence of nature; he dreamed of a dim and distant past, of the time of Saturn when the world was still innocent, when there were no ships plying the ocean in search of richness, when no wars raged, and when people were simple, pious, righteous and loyal. How he would love to have lived in those days.³⁶⁸

Horace's early poems are an articulation of the doubts he nurtured concerning contemporary society. He experienced the civil war's atrocities at first hand, and they made him lose his faith in Rome. One of the most important of all his poems, and probably his earliest, is *Epode* 16. 'Already a second generation is being

ground to pieces by civil war, and Rome through her own strength is tottering...this selfsame city we ourselves shall ruin, we, an impious generation, of stock accurst; and the ground shall again be held by beasts of prey.' These are the opening lines of this famous poem. As a priest-poet (*vates*) he addressed the Roman people, whom in his imagination he saw assembled around him, and called upon them to flee Rome by ship and to withdraw to the island of the blessed, where the earth effortlessly brings forth fruits, where the animals spontaneously place themselves at man's service, and where there are never any natural disasters: 'Jupiter set apart these shores for a righteous folk, ever since with bronze he dimmed the lustre of the Golden Age. With bronze and then with iron did he harden the ages, from which a happy escape is offered to the righteous, if my prophecy be heeded.'³⁶⁹

The civil wars made Horace lose his faith in Rome. The wars shocked young Virgil too. Arcadia in his *Eclogues* is a dream-world in which he found what he sought in vain in the real world, and suggests a nostalgia for repose and peace. His attitude is nonetheless more positive than Horace's. In his fourth eclogue he describes how a child has been born with whose birth a new age shall dawn: 'Only do you, pure Lucina, smile on the birth of the child, under whom the iron brood shall first cease, and a golden race spring up throughout the world!... He shall have the gift of divine life, shall see heroes mingled with gods, and shall sway a world to which his father's virtues have brought peace.'³⁷⁰

About the significance of this poem and the identity of the child—for Christians it was Jesus Christ—there are endless speculations in modern scholarly literature. The link with Horace's sixteenth epode is clear, as is also the fact that Virgil, by contrast to his contemporary, was full of confidence in the future of Rome.

V

THE EMOTIONAL LIFE OF THE YOUNG ROMAN

OLDER PEOPLE AND PARENTS

The greatest virtue a young man could possess, and his primary duty, consisted in showing respect for the older generation, parents and older people in general. That is not to say, however, that the young were never remiss in this regard.

Older persons

Cicero is certainly not the only one to think that it is the duty of the young to show deference to their elders (*est igitur adolescentis maiores natu vereri*) as it is the duty of the older generation to direct the inexperience of the young and keep them from what is bad (*ineuntis enim aetatis inscitia senum constituenda et regenda prudentia est; maxime autem haec aetas a libidinibus arcenda*).¹ Not without nostalgia, Aulus Gellius looks back to an idealized past when a higher age was respected as it ought to be: ‘Among the earliest Romans, as a rule, neither birth nor wealth was more highly honoured than age, but older men were revered by their juniors almost like gods and like their own parents, and everywhere and in every kind of honour they were regarded as first and of prior right.’²

Surely there will always have been young people who respected and even admired their elders,³ but in general a lack of respect (*irreverentia*) was held to be an essential trait of youth.⁴ No one describes this characteristic better than Pliny praising the youthful Junius Avitus who took him as his guide and mentor (*formatore morum, quasi magistro*): ‘This is rare in the young people of today, few of whom will yield to age or authority as being their superior.

They are born with knowledge and understanding of everything; they show neither respect nor desire to imitate, and set their own standards (*statim sapiunt, statim sciunt omnia, neminem verentur, neminem imitantur, atque ipsi sibi exempla sunt*).⁵

Several times already, mention has been made of young people who, alone or in a group, behaved impudently towards the older generation. I am thinking here especially of the conflicts between young and old in politics and in the army.⁶ The often tense relationship between children and parents will be dealt with in a following chapter. We can therefore be brief here.

A young man's *irreverentia* manifests itself in words and deed: 'Let us look back upon our youth and recall how often we were too careless about duty, too indiscreet in speech, too intemperate in wine',⁷ Seneca exclaims. He would have experienced this himself with his 'pupil' Nero. When he expresses the view that an adolescent needs special guidance (*regenda magis est fervida adulescentia*), Nero immediately retorts that he is old enough to know what to do: *aetate in hac sat esse consilii reor*.⁸ At school corporal punishment was not unusual at all,⁹ but the roles could be reversed, as happened to many teachers, including Rufus, the professor his students nicknamed 'the Cicero of the Rhône'.¹⁰ Ausonius, for his part, knew from his own experience how difficult it was for a teacher to deal with youths who have reached puberty, a difficult age (*vesticipes motu iam puberis aevi*). 'They refused to bear the yoke of command upon their necks and submitted not their mouths to the jagged bits thrust upon them. Hard the control, rough the experience, scanty the result...to govern headstrong youth (*indocilem iuventam*) with mild correction'.¹¹ The social status of teachers was low, but high rank was not spared either. Thus Caelius is accused of having beaten a senator during an election campaign.¹² Contempt of the older generation also comes to the fore where this youth speaks of 'rich old men' (*vos senes divites*),¹³ or where Catullus stamps the older generation as the 'descendants of Romulus' (*Romuli nepotes*) or 'crabbed old men' (*senes severiores*).¹⁴ In one of his school exercises (a *controversia*), the Elder Seneca tells us about a man who lost his three sons and was carried off by a debauched youth (*luxuriosus adulescens*) into a nearby garden, given a hair-cut and forced to attend a party in different clothes.¹⁵ With aversion Seneca recalls the shameless youth (*adulescens protervus*) who spat in the face of the philosopher Diogenes while he was giving a lecture on anger in

Rome (153 BC), no doubt to see how he would react.¹⁶ Centuries before, Socrates would have experienced something similar. The story goes that he was struck in the face, much to the indignation of the bystanders, by a bold and impudent youth. It cost the latter dear, however: for the rest of his days everybody jeered at him, and nicknamed him 'Kicker', which drove him to suicide.¹⁷

It was considered elementary etiquette to give up a seat to an elder.¹⁸ But that this rule was often broken should cause no surprise. In 21 AD there was a trial in Rome which, according to Tacitus, was not so important in itself but still raised quite a fuss. The reason was the behaviour of a youth of noble birth, one L. Sulla, who had refused to cede his seat at the games to a former praetor. The prosecution inveighed vehemently against such *iuventutis irreverentia* and recalled the severity with which such 'misdeeds' were punished in olden times.¹⁹

The irreverence of youth was not confined to rude words or impudent behaviour. In certain instances we have to do with real criminality. The poor in particular were the victims. The young man-about-town who cruised the streets of Rome at night, unable to sleep before he had beaten up some poor devil, has already been dealt with;²⁰ I have also spoken about a certain Volscius who was thrashed by Caeso and his brothers-in-arms, who, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 'laughed at him and abused him, as young men when drunk and arrogant are apt to abuse the humble and the poor'.²¹ In Phaedrus we read about an atrocious son who, as soon as his father left home, gave full rein to his ferocious youth (*fervida adolescentia*) by beating slaves.²² And as an example of the unbridledness and the lechery of so many youths (*quanta libido quantaque intemperantia sit hominum adolescentium*), C. Gracchus mentions a young man who was carried around in a litter. This moved a cowherd to laughter, but his laughter cost him dear, for the conceited fellow ordered the poor man to be beaten with the litter's carrying-straps, an ill-treatment he failed to survive.²³

Before leaving this section, I wish to say a few words about the famous—but cryptic—saying *sexagenarios de ponte* ('sixty-year old people from the bridge').²⁴ Many explanations have been given, which cannot all be discussed here. The proverb has been seen as a reference to the liquidation of old people in legendary times (or at the besieging of Rome by the Gauls in 390 BC), something very common in primitive societies, or to the fact that people who were over 60 were excluded from voting in the assemblies. Whatever the

meaning might be, we have to do with a clear example of a battle of the generations. The same can be said of the Menippean Satire *Sexagesis* of M. Terentius Varro.²⁵ Somebody falls asleep when he is 10 and wakes up at 60. Worried by the corruption he sees everywhere, he denounces in true Roman fashion the new morals but is thrown in the Tiber by the youth.

Parents²⁶

In a recent article of mine (see Eyben (1991)) the emphasis was on the father's attitude towards his children. In this book the attitude of youths towards their parents is stressed. The approach is therefore different, and the two studies are complementary.

During the whole of antiquity parents naturally expected obedience (*obsequium*) and respect (*reverentia*, *pietas*) from their children.²⁷ Like the Stoics, Cicero ranked the *pietas* owed to parents third after the respect owed to the gods and to the fatherland.²⁸ Epictetus described the role of an ideal son in the following terms: 'To treat everything that is his own as belonging to his father, to be obedient to him in all things, never to speak ill of him to anyone else, nor to say or do anything that will harm him, to give way to him in everything and yield him precedence, helping him as far as is within his power.'²⁹

A model son was very highly esteemed by Roman society, and someone who did not show his parents the required respect was very poorly thought of. Not to obey or respect a father was viewed as a serious matter, to strike him an outrage, to go to law against him an execrable step, to kill him an unimaginable heinous crime for which there was a particular punishment: patricides were sewn up into a leather sack and thrown alive into the Tiber.³⁰

Whenever we think of the Roman family, our thoughts immediately go to the *patria potestas*,³¹ the authority a father possessed over his children (and grandchildren), and which the lawyer Gaius claimed to be 'typically Roman': 'There are hardly any people who wield as much power over their sons as we do'.³² *In theory* a father had unlimited authority over all his legitimate children, irrespective of whether or not they were married, and of their offspring as long as he lived. Thus, for example, the *pater familias* had the right to expose his child, to scourge him, to sell him, to pawn him, to imprison him and, *in extremis*, even to kill him (the *ius vitae necisque*).³³

In the period we are dealing with, this portrait of a *paterfamilias* became more and more a theoretical and anachronistic one; or, to use the words of R.P.Saller, 'The stereotype of the Roman family is in many ways a myth.'³⁴ The more humane society became, the more paternal power was eroded, particularly as public opinion developed a distaste for undue strictness. From the days of the Empire onwards, the legislators adapted themselves gradually to the altered mentality and took as their rule of thumb the maxim we find in the writing of a third-century jurist: 'paternal authority must be based on love, not on cruelty' (*patria potestas in pietate debet, non atrocitate consistere*).³⁵ A reasonable amount of strictness was not thereby excluded, and the life-long nature of the *patria potestas* was never undermined.

'Strict' as well as 'understanding' parents³⁶ could not prevent conflicts between fathers and sons. While in earlier times the Romans tended to be excessively strict, it often happened during the late Republic or the Empire that parents were too accommodating *vis-a-vis* their children, with all the consequences of this excessive indulgence. Where, in days of yore, it was the children who trembled and shivered when confronted with their father, many children behaved now just as they pleased, as if there were no such a thing as paternal authority, while parents were terrified of their children and bent over backwards to accommodate all their whims. Cicero berated this state of affairs,³⁷ yet he probably did not realize, as will be seen shortly, that he was such a father himself. Livy, for his part, mourned the fact that in his day paternal authority meant nothing any more: *parentium vilis levisque apud liberos auctoritas*.³⁸ Seneca too was bitter in his complaints about the ingratitude of the youth (*quam ingrata sit iuventus*): 'What young man does not long for his father's last day though his hands are clean? Does not look forward to it though he curbs his desire? Does not ponder it though he is dutiful?'.³⁹

Unfortunately such wishes were not always confined to the area of vague daydreams.⁴⁰ According to Velleius Paterculus, fathers had most to fear from their sons during the proscriptions of the late Republic.⁴¹ Seneca complained about the extent of patricide in his day. He relates the story of a young man in the days of Augustus who tried to murder his father. When brought to trial, he was only condemned to exile since he was deemed to be still very young, had acted at the instigation of others and had in fact been rather timid

about it, all of which showed, in Seneca's opinion, that he was not totally corrupted.⁴²

It would be an exaggeration to claim that parents were always disappointed in their expectations. Roman antiquity knew of heroic examples of filial *pietas*: Aeneas, who rescued his father on his shoulders from the flames of Troy; or Titus Manlius, who was condemned to perform manual labour by his inhumanly cruel father, yet who, when his father was denounced, threatened his father's accuser with a knife to force him to withdraw his accusation.⁴³

In later times too there was no shortage of loving sons in everyday life.⁴⁴ Thus, for example, Marcus Aurelius, as described in the *Augustan History*: 'For three and twenty years he conducted himself in his father's home in such a manner that Pius felt more affection for him day by day, and never in all these years, save for two nights on different occasions, remained away from him.'⁴⁵ Thus Horace also, who in one of his *Satires* voices his gratitude to his father, who, although of humble stock, provided him with an excellent education:

Never while in my senses could I be ashamed of such a father,
and so I will not defend myself, as would a goodly number,
who say it is no fault of theirs that they have not free-born and
famous parents. Far different from this is what I say and what
I think: for if after a given age Nature should call upon us to
traverse our past lives again, and to choose in keeping with
our pride any other parents each might crave—content with my
own, I should decline to take those adorned with the rods and
chairs of state.⁴⁶

However, there were many parents who, despite their best intentions, had a strained relationship with their children. 'For fathers a child is always fear or pain', sighs the poet Evenus, quoted by Plutarch.⁴⁷ And, as Seneca writes,

So long as we count them severe, so long as we fail to
understand the benefits they give us, we have them with
us. When at last with age we have acquired some wisdom, and
it begins to be evident that we ought to love them for the very
things that kept us from loving them—their admonitions, their
strictness, and their careful watch over our heedless youth—

they are snatched from us. Few reach the age when they can reap some true reward from their children; the rest are aware of their sons by their burden.⁴⁸

Ps.-Plutarch, for his part, also believed that children usually turned a deaf ear to the good advice of parents, preferring to listen to those among their companions who encouraged drunken binges, licentiousness, dissolute behaviour, sloth and sexual escapades. 'Why should we give a thought to your father's threats? He's an old twaddler with one foot already in the grave, and before long we'll take his coffin on our shoulders and carry him out.'⁴⁹

There were many incidents of conflict between father and son. Fathers were saddened and outraged by the profligate conduct of their sons, their wild parties, their obsession with all sorts of entertainment; they were angry when their sons were scented, deceived them, got drunk, and gave out money right, left and centre on all sorts of expensive hobbies. Difficulties arose when their darling boys did not study as they ought to. Obviously even 'humane' parents could be angered by the love-affairs of their sons, especially when they refused to give up their girl-friends or concubines for a lawful wife.⁵⁰

Over-strict and over-lax parents were standard characters in the comedies of the day (as in the declamations). In Plautus and Terence,⁵¹ the plot often concerns a situation of conflict between a young man, who wants to sow his wild oats, and a father, who tries to knock sense into his son with either the stick or the carrot. It is obvious that from time to time a son will consider his father 'unreasonable'. We have an example in Terence's *The Self-Tormentor*, where we hear the young Clitiphon complain about his father—and all parents—in the following words:

What unfair judges fathers are to all young men! They think it right that we should be born greybeards straight-away and have no touch of the tastes which youth suggests (*rerum quas fert adolescentia*). They hold the reins to suit their own desires, the desires they have now, not those which they had years ago. If ever I have a son, I swear he shall find in me an indulgent father, I shall find means not only for discovering but also for pardoning an offence, not like my father, who shows me his sentiments under cover of another man.⁵²

On stage youngsters often kicked against the paternal authority, yet as a general rule even the most audacious of stage sons generally spoke of their fathers with some respect,⁵³ rarely contradicted them publicly, were deeply distressed if their frivolous behaviour was discovered, and at the end of the play always submitted to their father's will. To some extent this is probably attributable to the fact that any other portrayal of the father-son relationship would simply not be tolerated in the Rome of the day (c. 200-c. 150 BC). Youngsters in contemporary plays ultimately submitted to the moral pressure exerted upon them because they feared their fathers, but also for nobler reasons: namely, that they felt that obedience to parents took precedence over love for a girl-friend, simply because they realized that their father had their best interests at heart and better knew what was good for them than they themselves.⁵⁴

Filial respect for paternal authority was not everywhere to be found in day-to-day families in the first century BC. In that troubled period many parents must have had a quite terrible time with their children. An idea of paternal headaches can be gleaned from Cicero's troubles with his son Marcus and his nephew Quintus.⁵⁵ Unfortunately Cicero's correspondence with his son Marcus during the latter's stay in Athens has not been preserved. Nevertheless, one letter from Marcus has survived, thus enabling us for once to hear a young man's own voice.

It is clear that Marcus knew how to handle his credulous and all-too-accommodating father. At one stage he had been strictly forbidden to continue attending classes given by the teacher Gorgias, because he exerted a bad influence on him and, as we know from Plutarch,⁵⁶ encouraged him to pursue a life of drunkenness and sensuality. In a letter written to Tiro,⁵⁷ Cicero's secretary, the 20-year-old Marcus has this to say about the decision of 'his most kindly and well-beloved father':

It is true that I found Gorgias useful in my practice in declamation: but I thought everything else of secondary importance, provided I obeyed my father's instructions, who had written to me in explicit terms to get rid of Gorgias at once. I did not want to temporize, for fear my making too much of the business might strike my father as somewhat suspicious; and besides it occurred to me that it was a serious thing for me to pass judgment on the judgment of my father.

Marcus *filius* admits that at one stage his behaviour has been somewhat over the top, but that is now fully past-tense: 'For the errors of my youth (*errata aetatis meae*) have caused me such grief and agony that not only do my thoughts shrink from what I have done, but my very ears shrink from hearing it talked about.' He casually asks Tiro to send him a secretary, preferably a Greek, as soon as possible, so that he can save a lot of time wasted on note-taking. He goes on and on about the people in whose company he has spent his time. They were all exemplary, sterling characters: for example the philosopher Cratippus, for whom, as the son was doubtless aware, his father had the greatest respect:

I must tell you that my close attachment to Cratippus is not so much that of a pupil as that of a son. For not only do I attend his lectures with enjoyment, but I am greatly fascinated also by the charm of his personality. I spend whole days with him, and often a part of the night. Indeed I implore him to dine with me as often as possible. Now that we have become so intimate, he often strolls in upon us when we least expect him and are at dinner, and throwing to the winds all austerity as a philosopher, he bandies jokes with us in the most genial manner possible. Lay yourself out, therefore, Tiro, to win the acquaintance of such a man—so delightful and so distinguished as he is.

Marcus may well have pulled up his socks, yet it is far from certain. The 'repentant sinner' knew well that Tiro would show this letter to his father, that it would certainly put him in a good humour and that he would dig deep into his purse yet again.

The great orator certainly had a lot of problems with his son. Yet he was really put through the mill by his nephew Quintus, whom he largely educated himself. We know how Quintus made life singularly difficult for both his father and his uncle by his self-willed interventions in political life and how he caused embarrassment to them. The desire to prove his independence, a thing not uncommon among the youth of his day, was in his case particularly strong.

It is impossible here to follow all the ups and downs of this young man's career. The following will have to suffice as an example. When the civil war between Pompey and Caesar broke out in 49 BC, the 16-year-old Quintus came down firmly on Caesar's side. He wrote him a letter and set out for Rome on his own. He managed to

get an audience with Caesar's assistant, Hirtius, and with Caesar himself, and warned both that his uncle's sympathies were with Pompey. From a letter written to Atticus it emerges how bitterly disappointed Cicero was about his nephew:

He has turned out the bitterest disappointment of my life. He has been spoiled, I suppose, by our indulgence, and has gone to lengths that I dare not name.... All my humouring of him has been accompanied by considerable strictness: and I have had to put my foot down not over one fault of his or a small one, but over many grave faults. But his father's kindness should surely have been repaid by affection rather than by such cruel disregard.... But it is no fault of mine: it is his disposition which must cause us anxiety. That is what corrupted Curio and Hortensius' son, not their fathers' fault.⁵⁸

What we know about Cicero and his problem children is not literary fiction. The same is true of the papyrus letters written by children which have survived. Most beautiful is a letter from the (spoilt) child Theon, of whom it cannot be said that he was pleased with his father, who 'forgot' to take him with him on a trip to Alexandria:

Theon to his father Theon, greeting.

It was a fine thing of you not to take me with you to the city! If you won't take me with you to Alexandria I won't write you a letter or speak to you or say goodbye to you; and if you go to Alexandria I won't take your hand nor ever greet you again. That is what will happen if you won't take me. Mother said to Archelaus, 'It quite upsets him to be left behind.' It was good of you to send me presents...on the 12th, the day you sailed. Send me a lyre, I implore you. If you don't, I won't eat, I won't drink; there now!⁵⁹

Up to now we have dealt almost exclusively with the relationship between father and son. In Rome a *materfamilias*,⁶⁰ too, was held in high regard (more so than was the case in Greece), and managed to impress her stamp on her children, both girls and boys.

In a passage from Seneca, the mother emerges as a 'concerned' educator who cannot bear to see her child suffer.⁶¹ This does not mean that she was always loved and respected by her children. The young Augustine proves that point perhaps best. Once he reached

the age of puberty his mother Monica overwhelmed him with good advice, that he flee fornication, that he never commit adultery, 'but', these [words] seemed to me no better than the advice of women, which would be a shame for me to follow (*qui mihi monitus muliebres videbantur, quibus obtemperare erubescerem*). At the age of 18 he was converted to Manichaeism, a world-religion in those days. Monica was so upset that she refused him entry to the parental home, thus obliging him to move in with his friend Romanianus for a time. Some time later, when he decided to leave Carthage and set out for Rome, he planned his departure in a very underhand way, and even resorted to lying to find an excuse for leaving his mother at home, although she desperately, but in vain, begged him to take her with him.⁶²

Not all sons were as ungrateful as Augustine. Well known is the legendary example of Coriolanus, who led a Volscian army against his home town but raised the siege as a result of the entreaties of his mother, Veturia, and his wife, Volumnia.⁶³ In everyday life, too, exemplary sons were not lacking. The 16-year-old Quintus Cicero, for example (*puer Cicero sive iam adulescens*), had a difficult character (*multiplex pueri ingenium*) but loved his mother deeply. He suffered very much under the dissension between his elders, took sides with his mother against his father, and managed to reconcile the two.⁶⁴ Seneca, for his part, was loud in his praises of a 14-year-old youngster who did not wish to abandon his widowed mother, and this 'at an age when most children can scarcely endure the society of a father (*cum vix paternum [contubernium] liberi ferant*)'.⁶⁵ A real mother-fixation characterized Alexander Severus, who became emperor at age 13. Afraid of the dangers of freedom, power and flatterers at such a youthful age, his mother, Mammaea, tried to control and dominate this young man in his prime by all possible means, such as letting him study very hard, 'to give him no chance to turn his attention to any vice'.⁶⁶

Thus far we have considered some testimonies from literary sources. Nobody will be surprised that epigraphical texts show a son's affection for a deceased mother,⁶⁷ and there is no reason to think that what we read on the tombstones are only clichés having little or no content. Lifelike in any case are the testimonies which have come to us from the sands of Egypt. Thus the following moving letter (second-century AD), which a certain Sempronius wrote to his brother Maximus with regard to his mother:

Sempronius to his brother Maximus very many greetings.

Before everything I pray that you are well. I have been informed that you serve our mother and lady grudgingly. I beg you, sweetest brother, do not grieve her in anything; and if any of our brothers gainsays her, you ought to cuff them; for you ought now to take the name of father. I know that without my writing you are able to humour her, but do not be offended by my letter of admonition; *for we ought to revere our mother as a goddess*, especially one so good as ours. This I have written to you, brother, because I know how sweet a possession our revered parents are. Please write me about your welfare. Goodbye, brother.⁶⁸

‘We ought to revere our mother as a goddess...’: of course, not every son did so, and a mother also could be harsh, as is evident from the following letter (second-century AD) from a penitent son, who reminds us of the parable of the Prodigal Son:

Antonius Longus to Nilous his mother very many greetings.

I pray always for your health; every day I make supplication for you before the lord Serapis [an Egyptian god]. I would have you know that I did not expect that you were going up to the metropolis [Arsinoe]; for that reason I did not come to the city myself. I was ashamed to come to Karanis [the village where his mother lives], because I go about in filth. I wrote to you I am naked. I beg you, mother, be reconciled to me. Well, I know what I have brought on myself. I have received a fitting lesson. I know that I have sinned. I heard from...who found you in the Arsinoite nome [an Egyptian district], and he has told you everything correctly. Do you not know that I would rather be maimed than feel that I still owe a man an obol?⁶⁹

FRIENDS AND IDOLS

There can be a great resemblance between a ‘friend’ and an “idol”, but this is not necessarily the case. A friend can be an idol for his peer, but this will not always be so; an idol can be a friend for his admirer, but this is not a necessary condition for such a relationship.

Friends⁷⁰

In the description which Horace gives of the different ages of man, friendship (*amicitia*) emerges as a characteristic of adulthood.⁷¹ The poet is, of course, thinking of the cool, businesslike *amicitia* so typical of Rome, where reason and utility dominate, a relationship totally different from what our times understand by friendship, i.e. a personal relationship between two (or more) people, based on mutual attraction, liking, esteem, understanding, desire to stand by one another and the sharing of common interests. The Greek word *φιλία* suggests such a union of souls, and yet has wider significance than our concept of 'friendship', since it also covers the relationship between God and man, between man and woman, parents and children and even the relationship between states.

Friendship does not mean the same thing to a young man as it does to a child, adult or old man. Aristotle has given us a lot of psychologically rich information about it. In his description of the ages of man he points out that adolescents 'more than any other are fond of their friends and companions, because they take pleasure in living in company and as yet judge nothing by expedience, not even their friends'.⁷² Similar age and common upbringing promote in his eyes such a relationship, for 'two of the same age agree'.⁷³ 'Friends are an aid to the young, to guard them from error; to the elderly, to tend them, and to supplement their failing powers of action; to those in the prime of life, to assist them in noble deeds'.⁷⁴ The great philosopher distinguishes three sorts. The perfect friendship, which is based on virtue and rarely found; the less perfect, which is based on utility *or* on pleasure. Calculating friendship is typical of elderly people, 'as in old age men do not pursue pleasure but profit'.⁷⁵ Pleasure-seeking friendship, on the contrary, characterizes youth since

the young guide their lives by emotion, and for the most part pursue what is pleasant to themselves, and the object of the moment. And the things that please them change as their age alters; hence they both form friendships and drop them quickly, since their affections alter with what gives them pleasure, and the tastes of youth change quickly. Also the young are prone to fall in love, as love is chiefly guided by emotion, and grounded on pleasure; hence they form attachments quickly and give them up quickly, often changing

before the day is out. The young do desire to pass their time in their friend's company, for that is how they get the enjoyment of their friendship.⁷⁶

In the philosopher's eyes, the friendship based on pleasure, 'in which the same benefit is conferred by both parties', more closely resembles 'true' friendship; in such a relationship, indeed, there is no calculation and people take pleasure in one another's company, share tastes, treat one another as equals, 'as is the case with the friendships of young people'.⁷⁷

Among the Romans, Cicero wrote a most famous tract on friendship. It was his view that one found 'true' friendship only among adults, when age had conferred adequate strength and constancy (*corroboratis iam confirmatisque et ingeniis et aetatibus*); such relationship has to be assessed 'according to its stability and constancy' and not, 'as is customary with the young, on the basis of the warmth of affection (*non adolescentulorum more ardore quodam amoris*)'.⁷⁸

Cicero may well be correct when, like Aristotle before him, he deems youthful friendship to be lacking in stability, but it seems wrong to us when, unlike Aristotle, he speaks of such a relationship with some contempt. The following examples will prove that Aristotle's view of youthful friendship is applicable to Roman youth too.

We become acquainted with youthful comradeship in the comedies of Plautus and Terence, where the 'youthful helpmate' (*sodalis opitulator*) is a stereotype.⁷⁹ We see how young men on the stage make good cheer together, organize parties, are united by bonds of mutual sympathy and affection and stand by one another in word and deed, especially where love is concerned.⁸⁰ A typical pair of friends is Charinus and Eutyclus in Plautus' *The Merchant*. Charinus is desperate because his father tries to diddle him out of his beloved, but his boon companion Eutyclus knows how to straighten it out. In *The Two Bachelors*, Mnesilochus trusts the supervision of his girl-friend during his absence to his pal, Pistoclerus, who acquits himself loyally of his task, although appearances are against him. In *The Haunted House*, Philolaches does not dare to meet his father because he has squandered the family's fortune with his friend and girl-friend; his brother-in-arms Callidamates, however, knows to plead his case successfully with his father. Finally the *Three Bob Day* shows Lesbonicus and Lysiteles

as good friends. Lesbonicus has squandered all his possessions but his comrade will not let him down and is willing to marry his friend's sister without a dowry.

The foregoing are just some examples from the theatre, where youthful friendship was always subject to the vagaries of love. A more fascinating picture of this kind of friendship emerges from the poems of Catullus, the youthful poet *par excellence*, whose emotions in all fields were as intense as they were authentic.

This young man loved his friends, just as he hated his enemies,⁸¹ with all the fire and passion his youthful nature could muster. W.Kroll doubtless got it right when he wrote that friendship in the modern sense of the word prospered especially among such young people as were without political ambitions. Those friendships did not always last long, he says, 'but the momentary emotions they aroused were deep and tender and inspired wonderful occasional poetry'.⁸²

In the company of his friends, Calvus, Cinna, Veranius, with whom he spoke a specific jargon,⁸³ Catullus became self-confident and built up a protective wall against a hostile outside world which simply did not appreciate his youthful life-style and condemned it as 'debauchery' (*nequitia*).⁸⁴ In *carmen* 9, for example, he praises himself as the happiest of mortals now that his friend Veranius has returned from a long journey. In *carmen* 95, the (obscure) *Smyrna* of his friend Cinna, an epyllion dealing with the unnatural passion of Myrrha for her father, is extolled to the sky as the best of all poems ever written. In *carmen* 50 he describes how he and his bosom friend Calvus amused themselves one evening by composing doggerel for one another in a variety of metres. Back home he could not eat or sleep and wrote a poem for Calvus, 'his sweet friend' (*iucundus*), 'the apple of his eye' (*ocellus*), to tell him about his suffering and to ask a poem in return, 'lest Nemesis demand penalties in turn'.

Unfortunately not all comrades remain faithful. 'Rejoicing to high heaven, mortally depressed', in friendship as well as in everything else, Catullus goes from one extreme to another:

Leave off wishing to deserve thanks from any one, or thinking that any one can ever become grateful. All this wins no thanks; to have acted kindly is nothing, rather it is wearisome, wearisome and harmful; so is it now with me, who am vexed and troubled by no one so bitterly as by him who but now held me for his one and only friend.⁸⁵

The young Augustine was no less passionate than the young Catullus. 'What could pleasure me, unless to be in love and to be beloved?' (*Quid erat quod me delectabat, nisi amare et amari*), we read in his *Confessions*.⁸⁶ It will be seen shortly how love drew him to a girl, yet it was strong emotions, too, which drew him to his bosom pal.⁸⁷

We do not know the name of Augustine's most intimate friend (nor do we know that of his girl-friend). His friend and he knew each other already as children and grew up together. Their real friendship, however, began only when Augustine was about 18 and starting out as a teacher in his native village of Tagaste. It was a comradeship of infinite sweetness, particularly after the future Church Father had converted his soul-mate to Manichaeism. They had hardly been truly intimate a year when suddenly Augustine's *alter ego* fell ill and died.

The 'identity crisis' this tragedy provoked in Augustine is quite remarkable; long before such words as 'spleen' or *Weltschmerz* ever cropped up in European languages, we are confronted with a description of such feelings.

Grief darkened my hearth. Everything on which I set my gaze was death (*et quidquid aspiciebam mors erat*). My home town became a torture to me; my father's house a strange world of unhappiness; all that I had shared with him was without him transformed into a cruel torment. My eyes looked for him everywhere, and he was not there. I hated everything because they did not have him, nor could they now tell me 'look, he is on the way', as used to be the case when he was alive and absent from me. I had become to myself a vast problem (*factus eram ipse mihi magna quaestio*), and I questioned my soul 'Why are you sad, and why are you very distressed?' But my soul did not know what reply to give (*et nihil noverat [anima] respondere mihi*).

In the following lines Augustine describes how, like a young Werther *avant la lettre*, he could find solace only in tears, and how he was haunted by thoughts of death:

How does it come about that out of the bitterness of life sweet fruit (*suavis fructus de amaritudine vitae*) is picked by groaning and weeping and sighing, and mourning?... At that

time this was my state: I wept very bitterly and took my rest in bitterness (*et flebam amarissime et requiescebam in amaritudine*). I was so wretched that I felt a greater attachment to my life of misery than to my dead friend. Although I wanted it to be otherwise, I was more unwilling to lose my misery than him, and I do not know if I would have given up my life for him as the story reports of Orestes and Pylades.... I found myself heavily weighed down by a sense of being tired of living and scared of dying. I suppose that the more I loved him, the more hatred and fear I felt for the death which had taken him from me, as if it were my most ferocious enemy. I thought that since death had consumed him, it was suddenly going to engulf all humanity. That was, to the best of my memory, my state of mind (*sic eram omnino, memini*).... I was surprised that any other mortals were alive, since he whom I had loved as if he would never die was dead. I was even more surprised that when he was dead I was still alive, for he was my 'other self' (*ille alter*). Someone [Horace] has well said of his friend [Virgil]: 'He was half my soul' (*dimidium animae suae*). I had felt that my soul and his soul were 'one soul in two bodies'. So my life was to me a horror. I did not wish to live with only half of myself, and perhaps the reason why I so feared death was that then the whole of my much loved friend would have died (*ne totus ille moreretur, quem multum amaveram*).

Augustine could not live, he could not die. Nowhere could his 'lacerated and bloody soul' (*concosa et cruenta anima*) find any contentment 'nor in pleasant groves, nor in games or songs, nor in sweet-scented places, nor in exquisite feasts, nor in the pleasures of bedroom and bed, nor, finally, in books and poetry'. 'Everything was an object of horror, even light itself; all that was not he made me feel sick and was repulsive—except for groaning and tears. In them alone was there some slight relief. But when my weeping stopped, my soul felt burdened by a vast load of misery.'

So as to run away from himself,⁸⁸ he left Tagaste, where everything reminded him of his friend, and 'fled' to Carthage. In what follows Augustine provides a beautiful description of how time heals all wounds (*non vacant tempora, nec otiose volvuntur per sensus nostros*) and how contact with new friends and fellow-believers helped him to forget. It has been remarked earlier how, as

the Church Father shows, a peer-group can exert a destructive influence on the development of a youthful personality,⁸⁹ yet here he clearly describes how enriching such a group can be:

There were still other things [than Manichaeism] which occupied my mind in the company of my friends: to make conversation, to share a joke, to perform mutual acts of kindness, to read together well-written books, to share in trifling and serious matters, to disagree though without animosity—just as a person debates with himself—and in the very rarity of disagreement to find the salt of normal harmony, to teach each other something or to learn from one another, to long with impatience for those absent, to welcome them with gladness on their arrival. These and other signs come from the heart of those who love and are loved and are expressed through the mouth, through the tongue, through the eyes, and a thousand gestures of delight, acting as fuel to set our minds on fire and out of many to forge unity (*quasi fomitibus conflare animos et ex pluribus unum facere*).

So much for this important chapter from the life of the future Church Father, an episode in which we made acquaintance with classic examples of the bosom friend and the peer-group. The passage is concluded by Augustine with the following words, in which the quintessence of youthful friendship is outlined: 'This is what we love in friends. We love to the point that the human conscience feels guilty if we do not love the person who is loving us, and if that love is not returned—without demanding any physical response other than the marks of affectionate goodwill (*nihil quaerens ex eius corpore praeter indicia benevolentiae*). Hence the mourning if a friend dies, the darkness of grief, and, as the sweetness is turned into bitterness the heart is flooded with tears'.

There are still further examples of intimate youthful fellowship known to us from Christian antiquity. Thus, for example, John Chrysostom and a certain Basil (not the famous Church Father),⁹⁰ like Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzen, were great friends. Let us describe here only the youthful comradeship between the latter, as told by Gregory in his funeral oration for Basil.⁹¹

Their 'real' friendship started in Athens, where they were together as students. Gregory was there first and took care to see that Basil was received with open arms when he arrived in this

Mecca of knowledge and culture. 'His name was on the tongues of many before his arrival, and everyone considered it important to be the first to obtain the object of their desire.' Gregory managed to arrange things so that his friend did not have to undergo the customary student pranks,⁹² and thus he was almost the only newcomer to escape the general rule, 'a distinction beyond that generally accorded to new students'. This was the prelude of our friendship. This was the spark that enkindled our union. It was thus that we were struck with a mutual love'.

A short time later Gregory stepped into the breach to come to the rescue of his friend in an 'academic' discussion with Armenian students, who wanted to put the newcomer in his place and humiliate him. 'This was the second step in our friendship, no longer a spark but a flame that burned bright and high.' Basil was depressed because those students fell short of his high expectations of Athens, but Gregory managed to cheer him up and thus bound him to himself still more:

Then, as time went on, we mutually avowed our affection for each other, and that philosophy [i.e. Christianity] was the object of our zeal. Thenceforth we were all in all to each other, sharing the same roof, the same table, the same sentiments, our eyes fixed on one goal, as our mutual affection grew ever warmer and stronger.... We were impelled by equal hopes in the pursuit of learning, a thing especially open to envy. But envy was absent, and emulation intensified our zeal. There was contest between us, not as to who should have the first place for himself, but how he could yield it to the other, for each of us regarded the glory of the other as his own. We seemed to have a single soul animating two bodies.... Two ways were familiar to us: the first and more precious leading us to our sacred buildings and the masters there; the second, and the one of less account, to our secular teachers. All else—festivals, spectacles, assemblies, and banquets—we left over to those with a taste for such things.

Rather than undermine their faith—the fate of so many students — the bastion of paganism that was Athens actually bolstered it. They supported each other in their pursuit of virtue, they sought only the company of virtuous youths, young men who shared their

aspirations, and ended up forming a sort of religious community with Basil at the head.

For many long years Gregory and Basil lived at close quarters. When the day came for them to leave Athens, fellow-students and teachers implored them to stay. Gregory let himself be persuaded, but Basil 'betrayed' his friend and left Athens. Gregory actually found it difficult to remain much longer. Everyone felt sorry for him, and he had to keep repeating the explanation of why they had split up. With his soul-mate gone, the university city lost all its charms. So he soon cut the ties with those holding him back and rushed away to join his friend.

Idols⁹³

A young man often fails to treat people in his environment—especially his seniors—with the proper respect. These words are surely all too often true. But youth is full of contradictions, and thus one can also quite legitimately say that a young man can see an elder as an ideal, as someone who incarnates the values he would like to embody in his own life, as someone with whom he would wish to identify, as someone he would aspire to imitate. Such an 'idol' can be a contemporary, but mostly it will be someone older.

Like the Greeks, the Romans were keenly aware of how important a concrete ideal was for a young man. Their educational system had as a cardinal premise the power of good example. Cicero believed that the greatest virtue a young man can possess, his first and most important duty, was to enrich himself with the wisdom of prominent statesmen and to mould himself after their example (*quos sibi delegerint ad imitandum*).⁹⁴ Seneca, even more than Cicero, emphasizes the moral importance of such an example: 'Cherish some man of high character, and keep him ever before your eyes, living as if he were watching you, and ordering all your actions as if he beheld them.' 'Let us choose not men who pour forth their words with the greatest glibness...but men who teach us by their lives, men who tell us what we ought to do and then prove it by practice, who show us what we should avoid, and then are never caught doing that which they have ordered us to avoid.'⁹⁵

A young Roman certainly did not always need such advice, and often spontaneously went looking for 'models'. He usually found such a guide outside the family circle where his father was the embodiment of authority. The influence exerted by the idol was

certainly not always positive. As has been seen, it could happen that a youth was obsessed with a politician such as Catiline or an unsavoury character from the world of entertainment; it was, however, probably at least as often the case that he raved about a person (a politician, orator, philosopher, teacher) of high standing.

It was not unusual for an adolescent to hero-worship someone completely beyond his reach, a famous figure of the past or from a foreign country. Someone like Alexander the Great certainly fired the imagination of many youths, the young Pompey being a case in point.⁹⁶ At the age of 26, Augustine dedicated his (lost) work *On the Fair and the Fit* to Hierus, a Roman orator. He was not personally acquainted with him, yet admired him because everyone spoke so highly of his eloquence and his knowledge of philosophy. The future Church Father pointed out the clear difference between his reverence for this man and his admiration for a famous actor or charioteer: though it would never have crossed his mind to resemble one of the latter, he did endeavour to be Hierus' match. And how important he considered it that Hierus should know his work! If this man would appreciate it, his enthusiasm would be boundless; if not, he would hardly be able to stifle his disillusionment.⁹⁷

The young also had common idols, persons holding a special attraction for all—or many—youths. Such admirers were not necessarily closely acquainted with their 'hero'; in many cases it was a matter of adoration from a distance.

During the late Republic, young men often idolized politicians and orators. Despite his decided opinions, the Elder Cato was a shining example of eloquence for the youth of his day, who were enticed by the attractiveness of his language and by his considerable experience in politics.⁹⁸ According to his brother Quintus, Cicero too had many studious youngsters deeply attached to him.⁹⁹ When the great orator was himself a young man, all the youths of his day went into raptures about Hortensius' Asiatic art, whereas—as has been seen already—the older generation was rather averse to and scandalized by it.¹⁰⁰

During the days of the Empire, it often happened that a teacher, a philosopher or rhetorician became particularly popular with youth. People came to such a man from all parts of the Graeco-Roman world; they wanted to be like him, not only in their way of speaking but also in their appearance. Thus some students of the Phoenician sophist Adrian tried to imitate his accent, others his walk, still others the elegance of his attire,¹⁰¹ whereas the students

of Porcius Latro went so far as to take a potion to acquire the same pale skin-colour as their teacher's.¹⁰² When such a 'star' moved to another city, he was often followed by his admirers, as was the case with the sophist Scopelian of Clazomenae,¹⁰³ who registered such success with an oration in Rome that a group of prominent youths followed him back to Ionia.¹⁰⁴

As typical of the—personal—relation between a teacher and his students we can take the aforementioned Adrian, who was successively the official rhetorician of Athens and of Rome. As Philostratus tells us, after each lecture he was accompanied to his home by his 'international' audience, who 'went so far as to reverence him just as the tribes of Eleusis reverence the initiating priest when he is ceremoniously performing rites'. He won their sympathy by organizing games, wine parties, hunts, by taking part with them in the Hellenic festivals and by keeping up with them the most boisterous Greek dance, 'thus adapting himself to their youthfulness and all its varied interests, so that they felt towards him as sons feel towards a father who is amiable and indulgent'.¹⁰⁵

The group idol could also be a philosopher. An early example in Roman history is that of Carneades, who, as has been seen already, in 155 BC inspired Roman youth with such an enthusiasm for philosophy that they deserted all their other pleasures to listen to his lectures.¹⁰⁶ The appeal of philosophers was especially great under the Empire. The Stoic Musonius Rufus, for example, attracted young people from everywhere, 'as a magnet draws iron'; his popularity with youth was so great that Nero exiled him, together with the rhetorician Verginius, for being dangerous to the state.¹⁰⁷

We know already how Seneca, as a young man, was fanatical about his teacher, Attalus.¹⁰⁸ When he, in his turn, became an established author and philosopher, he was so popular with the youth of his day that Quintilian felt obliged to protest. In his review of Latin literature this rhetorician and educator came to Seneca last, not because he found him particularly bad, but because there was a general, though false impression, he says, that he condemned and even detested him. His criticisms concerned his 'depraved style, weakened by every kind of error' and dated from some years previously, when Seneca's works were in the hands of every young man: *tum autem solus hic fere in manibus adolescentium fuit*. It was not Quintilian's aim to ban reading of his works completely, but he wished to prevent him being chosen in preference to better

authors. 'But the young men loved him rather than imitated him, and fell as far below him as he fell below the ancients. For I only wish they had equalled or at least approached his level. But he pleased them for his faults alone (*placebat propter sola vitia*) and each individual sought to imitate such of those faults as lay within his capacity to reproduce: and then brought reproach on his master by boasting that he spoke in the genuine Senecan manner.'¹⁰⁹

Quintilian's view of Seneca was thus nuanced. One thing is clear: namely, that the youthful devotees of Seneca were obsessed with his baroque, Asiatic style, a prose bristling with quotable maxims. Even though Quintilian does not mention the fact explicitly, it can safely be assumed that a lot of young men were fascinated too by the philosopher's message, for philosophy, as has been seen, held a great appeal for the younger generation.

Seneca was clearly the common idol of the youth of the day. There was certainly no question of a *personal* contact between all those youngsters and their mentor. Yet that is precisely what they desired.

The longing for a personal contact is clearly true in Cicero's case. As a young man he could not hear enough of the lawyer 'Scaevola and stood in awe of the orators Crassus and Mark Antony, keeping their company as much as he could and bombarding them with questions.'¹¹⁰ Once he himself became an established orator, he was a shining example for the younger generation. In his work we become acquainted with several of his faithful admirers. The young Plancus, for example, attached himself absolutely and unconditionally to the great orator 'as soon as he was capable of independent judgement'; Crassus' sons too followed Cicero blindly in all things, especially Lucius, 'who loved and honoured him as another father (*sicut alterum parentem, et observat, et diligit*)'.¹¹¹

Like Cicero, young Sulpicius, idolized Antony and, especially, Crassus. He tagged on to them everywhere, always trying to bring them to a discussion on oratory. As an orator, this youth was (again like Cicero) hot-headed and impetuous, a consequence of his tender years. Antony gave him a bit of sound advice: he should exercise his craft in the forum, and not in a school of rhetoric, and take a famous orator—Antonius suggests Crassus—as his model. In a short time the young man's art had (again as was the case with Cicero, this time influenced by Molon) undergone a veritable metamorphosis and strongly resembled that of his idol, Crassus.¹¹²

Under the Empire too, famous orators continued to fascinate the young. Tacitus was a model for Pliny as an *adulescentulus*,¹¹³ while the former tells us how he himself as a youth raved about Marcus Aper and Julius Secundus, then the leading lights of the bar:

Of both of them I can say that—being passionately fond of rhetorical studies, and fired with youthful enthusiasm (*studiorum cupiditate et quodam ardore iuvenili*)—I made a practice not only of listening attentively to their pleadings in court, but also of attaching myself to them at their homes and attending them out of doors. I wanted to drink in their casual talk as well, and their discussions, and the confidences of their esoteric discourse.¹¹⁴

It is well known how the younger Pliny did all within his power to attract the young to himself;¹¹⁵ and—unless he deceived himself—in a good many cases he seems to have been successful. In one of his letters he complains about the brazenness of the youth of his day, who know respect for nothing and none. The behaviour of Junius Avitus, however, is in marked contrast to that of his peers. This young man loves and admires Pliny ‘as his moral guide and mentor’ (*ita me diligebat, ita verebatur, ut me formatore morum, me quasi magistro uteretur*). ‘His wisdom consisted in his belief that others were wiser than himself, his learning in his readiness to be taught. He always sought advice for his studies or his duties in life, and always went away feeling he was made better; and indeed he *was* better, either from the advice given him or from the very fact that he had asked for it.’¹¹⁶ With great enthusiasm the same Pliny elsewhere describes the masterly performance of two of his faithful followers, who likewise consider him their mentor, their model, their teacher (*ut rectorem, ut magistrum*) and who make it clear to all listeners that they want to resemble him and follow in his footsteps.¹¹⁷

As has been said already, the model who inspired the young under the Empire was not necessarily someone high on the social ladder. In many cases he was a teacher. Plutarch considered it the most natural thing in the world that a pupil should originally attend classes out of necessity; yet gradually, as a bond was formed between teacher and pupil, they began to consider one another as intimate friends and even called each other just that.¹¹⁸

This last statement is illustrated well by the tender and intimate relationship between Marcus Aurelius and his teacher Fronto,¹¹⁹ which emerges so clearly from their correspondence. The young Marcus never lets an occasion slip for expressing his admiration, even his love, for his hero. No superlatives were sufficiently expressive to put into words his feelings. How deeply concerned he was about his older friend's health! How deeply he was smitten when separated from him! How respectfully he looked up to him! How enthusiastically he greeted his friend's literary output! There was nothing dearer to him than his master, nothing could prevent him from continuing to cherish his beloved Fronto: 'You shall never drive your lover (*erastes*), I mean me, away.... So passionately, by Hercules, am I in love with you, nor am I frightened off by the law you lay down, and even if you shew yourself more forward and facile to others, who are non-lovers, yet will I love you while I have life and health'; 'Farewell, most missed of men and dearest to your Marcus, most honourable consul, master most sweet. Farewell, my sweetest soul (*anima dulcissima*).'¹²⁰

There can be no doubt about the sincerity of Marcus' feelings for Fronto. The master, for his part, responded to this love with love, as is evident from the following passage, in which he is looking for an explanation of their friendship. After saying that no benefit at all obliged Marcus to him, he continues:

And yet there is nothing I like better than that there should be no reason for your love of me.... By love I understand such as is fortuitous and free and subject to no cause, conceived by impulse rather than by reason, that needs no services, as a fire logs, for its kindling, but glows with self-engendered heat.... In a word, love spontaneous is as superior to love earned by service as fortune is to reason.... I do right in preferring to be loved by intuition and chance rather than by reason and my merits. Wherefore, even if there is any adequate reason for your love for me, I beseech you, Caesar, let us take diligent pains to conceal and ignore it. Let men doubt, discuss, dispute, guess, puzzle over the origin of our love as over the fountains of the Nile.¹²¹

During the Christian era, too, young men were anxious to find a model to imitate. Thus young Nepotianus idolized Jerome, who drew up a spiritual *vade mecum* for him,¹²² whereas Alypius adored his

teacher Augustine because he seemed to him ‘a good and learned man’ (*bonus et doctus*).¹²³ The future Church Father also exerted considerable influence over the 17-year-old Licentius, whom, as we have seen, he ‘cured’ from an exaggerated passion for poetry. This youth’s ‘conversion’ to philosophy is a clear demonstration of how a young man can be touched at the very roots of his being under influence of his ‘ideal’. On one particular morning, without the knowledge of his fellow-students, Licentius visited his teacher and asked him straight out what he thought of him: *quid me existimes?* Moved, Augustine took him by the hand and in an intimate conversation praised his pupil’s character and disposition. Deeply impressed, Licentius left.¹²⁴

Quite comparable with this relationship between Augustine and Licentius is that which, centuries earlier, existed between the Greek Polybius—deported to Rome after the battle of Pydna (168 BC)—and the 18-year-old son of Paullus Aemilius, the future Scipio Africanus Minor—a relationship pregnant with historical significance for the evolution of Roman society and culture.

At the instance of Scipio and his brother Fabius, the future historian Polybius was given permission to stay on in Rome while the other hostages were dispersed all over Italy. Through discussions on literature, their companionship became more and more intimate. One day, Scipio was taking a walk with Polybius. ‘In a quiet and gentle voice, and blushing slightly’ (*τῷ χρώματι γένομενος ἐνερευθής*), Scipio suddenly addressed his educator as follows:

Why, Polybius, since there are two of us, do you constantly converse with my brother and address to him all your questions and explanations, but ignore me? Evidently you also have the same opinions of me that I hear the rest of my countrymen have. For, as I am told, I am believed by everybody to be a quiet and indolent man (*ἡσύχιος τις καὶ νωθρός*) with none of the energetic character of a Roman, because I don’t choose to speak in the law courts. And they say that the family I spring from does not require such a protector as I am, but just the opposite; and this is what I feel most.

Polybius was bewildered by hearing this totally unexpected outburst and tried immediately to reassure the young Scipio:

For goodness' sake, Scipio, don't talk in that way, or get any such notion into your head. I don't, I assure you, do this because I have a low opinion of you or ignore you, but because your brother is your senior. I both begin conversation with him and finish with him, and as for any explanations and advice, I address myself especially to him in the belief that your opinions are the same as his. However, now I admire you when you say that you are pained to think that you are of a milder character than becomes members of this family; for that shows that you have a high spirit. I myself would be delighted to do all in my power to help you to speak and act in a way worthy of your ancestors. For as for those studies which I see now occupy and interest you, you will be in no want of those ready to help both of you; so great is the crowd of such men that I see flocking here from Greece at present. But as regards what you say now troubles you, I don't think you could find anyone more efficient than myself to forward your effort and help you.

Scipio was moved, and quick to accept Polybius' invitation. He had found a guide to help him become 'somebody'. He grasped his idol's right hand in both his own and pressed it firmly with the words: 'Would I could see the day on which you, regarding nothing else as of higher importance, would devote your attention to me and join your life with mine; for then I shall at once feel myself to be worthy of my house and my forefathers (*ἄξιος τῶν προγόνων*).'¹²⁵

So much for this memorable meeting. It is obvious how insecure the young Scipio felt, how uncertain he was about his sense of values, about what others thought of him, how he was tortured by the feeling of discomfort bubbling within him, and how he was actually going through a sort of 'crise d'originalité juvenile' (M. Debesse). This meeting, however, was not only of great significance on the personal level. P.Friedländer discusses it in an article entitled 'Socrates enters Rome'. A.-J.Festugière calls this text 'one of the most deeply moving in world literature' and gives it pride of place in his chapter 'The misgivings of a young pagan: from Scipio Aemilianus to the good tidings of Christ'. For K.Büchner, too, this passage is one of the most important documents of Roman history: 'It was Rome's good fortune that *Tyche* brought together two such noble characters. In the intercourse between these two, which lasted until their death, the Roman character gained the self-confidence,

maturing in its admiration for the Greek, without losing any of the essence of its being, of those virtues that had made Rome great.¹²⁶

SEX AND LOVE¹²⁷

It was the grammarian Servius' conviction that every age had its own special characteristic: 'The fate of old age is resting and doing nothing (*senectae sors quies est et otium*), just as for childhood it is playing (*pueritiae ludus*), for youth it is love (*amor adolescentiae*) and for adulthood it is pursuing ambition (*ambitus iuvenalis aetatis*).'¹²⁸ Love and sex certainly tend to dominate the concerns of a great many young people: they are an integral part of the 'game' (*ludus*), which is usually tolerated in the young¹²⁹ as long as certain 'rules' are observed; they are often, however, much more than 'just' a game.

What was permitted, what was forbidden¹³⁰

In antiquity, sex was generally—but not always¹³¹—taken completely for granted. Whoever is hungry eats, whoever is thirsty takes a drink, whoever feels his sexual urge rising satisfies it. It was as matter-of-fact as that.

However broad-minded the ancients may have been, they still had a notion of perversion and obscenity. It was not as if anything and everything was permitted or tolerated; nor was everything considered 'natural' or 'normal'. Incest (sexual intercourse with blood relations to the sixth, and then later on to the fourth degree) was forbidden by law in Rome; masturbation was a practice which one usually did not tell all and sundry about; certain forms of sexual intercourse (*fellatio*, *irrumatio*, tonguing, voyeurism, exhibitionism)¹³² were considered disgusting, any sexual hankypanky with a free-born woman (or man), married or single, was strictly forbidden.

We find the guiding principle of Roman sexual ethics clearly articulated by Plautus in the words addressed by a slave to his youthful master: 'Provided you keep away from married women, widows, virgins, young innocents, and children of respectable families, love anyone you want.'¹³³ There were thus (important!) restrictions, yet the large numbers of male and female slaves as well as freedmen offered a youth (as well as an adult) more than enough opportunity to satisfy his sexual passion. Nonetheless, in these

relationships also a certain decorum was expected. Unseemly behaviour won a (young) man a bad reputation, while a family's good name ran the risk of being compromised if in a 'permitted' heterosexual relationship the man did not show a suitable sense of proportion and a certain amount of discretion,¹³⁴ or if he tended to squander his father's money or property.¹³⁵ Moreover, a young man was expected to put an end to 'sowing his wild oats' in time, to forsake the *concessum aetati* and get married to a girl of his own status, somebody with whom marriage was permissible.¹³⁶

Prostitution¹³⁷—as well as masturbation¹³⁸—was a normal outlet for sexual desires, it prevented worse forms of sexual indulgence.¹³⁹ There is a well-known story related about the honourable Elder Cato, who congratulated a youth leaving a brothel 'thinking that lust (*libido*) had to be curbed without crime (*crimen*)'. Yet, finding him there too often, he warned him with the words: 'I praised you because you came here, not because you lived here!'¹⁴⁰ Even Cicero sees no problems in this field, at least in his *Pro Caelio*:

If there is anyone who thinks that youth should be forbidden affairs even with courtesans (*meretricii amores*), he is doubtless eminently austere (I cannot deny it), but his view is contrary not only to the licence of this age, but also to the custom and concessions of our ancestors. For when was this not a common practice? When was it blamed? When was it forbidden? When, in fact, was it that what is allowed was not allowed?¹⁴¹

'Ladies of the night' were plying their trade in Rome from early on, especially in the entertainment centres of the city such as the Subura, the Tuscus (notorious for male prostitution) and the Mons Caelius. Often they were slave-girls, quite often freedwomen, sometimes even free-born. The latter were able to work as independent agents, but very often, just like their colleagues, they were employed by pimps who were quite unscrupulous. Whores either walked on the streets, or solicited the custom of their clients from the brothel door or from behind the window. By law they were obliged to wear a kind of uniform—a short undergarment (*tunica*) without *instita* (the border, laid in several plaits) and a toga in a dark colour—by which they could be distinguished from respectable women, but quite often they cut a dashing figure by wearing a daring and often see-through dress. The brothels were recognizable

by a signboard above the door. They could be quite luxuriously appointed inside, with pornographic statues and paintings, yet mostly the whores plyed their trade in dirty, dark, narrow, poorly ventilated rooms at fairly low prices. It is worth mentioning that males also (especially children) practised this 'profession',¹⁴² probably a good deal more publicly than in our own society.

Rejection of love and/or sexuality¹⁴³

As has already been pointed out, it would be a mistake to think that the Romans were totally devoid of sexual morals. Parents and teachers worth the name gave the children anything but a libertine education. Juvenal's exhortation is quite typical, and he certainly does not mince his words:

Abstain from things which you must condemn: for this there is at least one all-powerful motive, that our crimes be not copied by our children.... Let no foul word or sight cross the threshold within which there is a father. Away with the songs of the night-revelling parasite! If you have any evil deed in mind, you owe the greatest reverence to the young (*maxima debetur puero reverentia*); disregard not your boy's tender years (*nec tu pueri contempseris annos*), and let your infant son (*filius infans*) stand in the way of the sin that you propose.¹⁴⁴

As in our own time, exemplary parents and teachers were thin on the ground, yet it is obvious that there were such, and that not all educators failed to do their duty. According to Quintilian, many parents had their children educated privately out of moral considerations, because they believed that morals at school were corrupt, while this was—in the parents' opinion at least, but not according to this great pedagogue—not the case at home.¹⁴⁵ Typical also was the fact that—as we know from Cicero, for instance—unlike the Greeks, the Romans shied away from nakedness in sport, that a father no longer took a bath with his son once the latter had reached the age of puberty,¹⁴⁶ that Quintilian—and doubtless most other teachers—believed that reading the elegiac poets, Horace and the comedians—by our standards certainly anything but 'pornographic' poetry—should be reserved for mature pupils (*certe ad firminus aetatis robur reserventur...cum mores in tuto*

fuertint),¹⁴⁷ that the Emperor Augustus ordered that the brothels should only open their doors after the ninth hour, the time by which the youngsters had come home from their exercises in the Campus Martius.¹⁴⁸ Significant also is the fact that the Greek love-novels, written for a larger public, are characterized by an idealistic view of love and chastity in both the girl and the boy.¹⁴⁹

It was not alone—or not so much—thanks to his education but also thanks to his own nature that not every young man was equally attracted by love or the sexual—two concepts which in antiquity were far from synonymous.

In one of his earliest satires, Horace sets out to defend traditional Roman (and Epicurean¹⁵⁰) morality. The young poet is afraid not so much of sexual pleasure as of love. At all costs one has to avoid association with married women. Why would one choose the difficult path when the easy one is there for the asking? This can be achieved by an affair with the first girl that comes one's way, and it is such 'love' that the probably twenty-four-year-old Horace recommends to his readers.¹⁵¹ It is clear that many youngsters in their associations with the other (or their own) sex merely sought release for their sexual urges and, as Piso (tribune in 149 BC) said, were addicted to their penis (*adulscntes peni deditos*).¹⁵²

In Plautus' *Three Bob Day*, we make the acquaintance of Lysiteles, who, as his name suggests, was a cautious youth, the type of young man who rationalizes love. Like a new Heracles at the crossroads,¹⁵³ he racks his brains for a long time as to whether he should follow the path of love or of virtue. A man who surrenders himself to love cannot enjoy a moment's peace, is tortured by a thousand and one cares, flees the forum, his parents and even his own better self. Such a young man really must put his money where his mouth is. The youth after long and painful thought finally opts for self-interest. He will achieve fame, honour and influence. Unlike his opposite number, Lesbonicus, he will find no place for love in his life.¹⁵⁴

Both Horace and Lysiteles believed that one must avoid love, but not necessarily sex (or marriage). There are examples also from antiquity of young men who turned their backs on sexual relations, either because they were influenced by certain philosophical or religious movements, or quite simply because sex left them ice-cold.

Early in antiquity an ascetic trend¹⁵⁵ already existed. There were philosophical schools such as Orphism, Pythagoreanism, Stoicism and Neoplatonism which were not at all broad-minded on that

score. According to (Neo?) Pythagorean doctrine, a youth should be brought up in such a way that he did not desire sexual contact before he reached his twenties, and even then he should exercise restraint.¹⁵⁶ For the Stoic Musonius Rufus, sex was only permissible within marriage, and then only with the intention of begetting children.¹⁵⁷ Reading between the lines, it is safe to conclude that for this philosopher not only adultery but also homosexuality and pre-marital sex were forbidden.

There were also cults according to whose beliefs sexual intercourse involved ritual—although mostly no moral—impurity. A mythological—and extreme—example is that of Attis. Catullus' poem on this youthful consort of Cybele is well known. With a deep empathy, the young poet describes this shepherd-boy, who, driven by revulsion from the sexual (*Veneris nimio odio*), left for Pessinus in Phrygia, where he castrated himself, together with his youthful friends (*ephebi*), so as to dedicate himself completely to 'his' goddess Cybele.¹⁵⁸

Attis thus became the prototype of the eunuch devotees (*galli*) of this goddess, who castrated themselves, usually when still young.¹⁵⁹ Self-inflicted castration was also well known to early Christianity, despite the fact that 'official' Church teaching forbade it. So Origen 'did a thing which gave abundant proof of an immature and youthful mind'. His struggle with his passions, which led him to apply literally the words of Matthew 19, 12 and make himself a eunuch for the Kingdom of God when he was 17 is particularly famous.¹⁶⁰

Given the grip which philosophy and religion had on the young,¹⁶¹ there can be no doubt but that some (but how many?) young people wanted to practise what was preached and were willing to go to great lengths in sexual abstinence. Young men who felt no attraction whatever to the sexual were an entirely different story. Generally speaking, they were not considered abnormal. Cicero bragged about the fact that even in his youth (*ne iuvenem quidem*) the sexual never held any attraction for him.¹⁶² According to Nicolaus of Damascus in his panegyric of Augustus' youth, young Octavian left his home to visit the temples only at night, thus avoiding the many women who tried to ensnare him. He lived in abstinence for an entire year, 'this at an age when young men, especially those who are rich, are especially licentious'.¹⁶³ In his consolation to Marcia, Seneca praises Marcellus, 'a young man of keen mind, of commanding ability, yet withal marked by a frugality and self-restraint that, for one of his years and wealth, commanded the highest admiration'. He was a

most beautiful youth (*adulescens rarissimae formae*), living chastely amidst many beauties, 'the corrupters of men', yet he lent himself to the hopes of none; but when one of them tried to make advances to him, 'he blushed with shame as if he had sinned even by pleasing them (*erubuit, quasi peccasset, quod placuerat*)'.¹⁶⁴

In later antiquity too such young men can be found. Suffice it to mention here the young Alypius, Augustine's friend, who could not understand why his 30-year-old 'ideal' shied from joining an ascetical commune, 'because he could not live without a woman',¹⁶⁵ as the future Church Father himself related. Alypius himself had sexual intercourse with a woman at the beginning of puberty (*in ingressu adulescentiae*), but his experience afforded him no pleasure; quite on the contrary: sexual contact filled him with horror, and from then on he lived a life of complete chastity.¹⁶⁶

By way of rounding off this section, the cases of two mythological figures will be discussed: Narcissus and Hippolytus. Of course, we are dealing with young men from Greek mythology but the Romans, too, were familiar with them as representatives of youth.

When Narcissus¹⁶⁷ in Ovid's story had reached puberty, his sixteenth year (line 351), and seemed either boy or man (*poterat puer iuvenisque videri*, line 352) one of the girls who was in love with him was the nymph Echo, who could only repeat the last few words she heard. Narcissus, however, gave her and many others the cold shoulder. One of his helpless victims pleaded with the heavens for vengeance: 'So may he himself love, and not gain the thing he loves' (line 405). This prayer was heard. The egoistic Narcissus fell in love with his own mirror-image in the water of a limpid source and died. His body was never found, but on the place he died was found a narcissus.

Ovid, who was clearly aware of eroticism centred on the self, conveys a good idea of what *could* happen in the Roman world too. There is no trace of sympathy with Narcissus. Refusing love with others was something the healthy, well-adjusted Ancients were unable to accept. In love, abstinence has to be punished, and this is an ethic which causes us no surprise coming from the lips of love's greatest bard.

Like Narcissus, Hippolytus,¹⁶⁸ with whom we are familiar from Euripides' play, was a mythological figure. He was aged about eighteen,¹⁶⁹ exquisitely built, athletic, modest and upright. Purity was his greatest virtue. He refused to honour Aphrodite, choosing rather to dedicate himself to Artemis, the goddess of hunting and

chastity. He was a virgin, had an ascetic life-style, had no sexual longings, knew love only through having heard about it or seen it in pictures, and even then he preserved custody of his eyes and ears as best he could. He felt attracted to supernatural powers, to 'his' goddess, Artemis, to whom he was totally devoted and in whom he lost himself completely.

In one of his remarkable studies, A.-J. Festugière stresses the unique character of Hippolytus' love and mystic piety:

It is because that Artemis who is the lady of his thoughts, to whom he is forever speaking, and who answers him, is an inner image, more present to the eye of the soul than Hippolytus is to himself. But that is the very definition of love. The lover is emptied of himself; the being who lives in him is his beloved; he no longer sees or hears any other except that being; he is, as it were, possessed by her. Now when the beloved person is a divine being, we then speak of mystical love. For it is evident that there is here no question of physical union, but of soul with soul. The divinity is constantly present in the soul of the worshipper. The whole joy of the believer is in his consciousness of the presence of his god.¹⁷⁰

F. Mench, too, has sensitive and enlightening insights into the figure of this hero. In the eyes of this scholar, the underlying motif of Euripides' play lies in the confrontation of two worlds, the shame-culture of the older generation, based on reputation and appearances, and the guilt-culture of the younger generation, based on the human conscience. The hero of the tragedy is 'the example *par excellence*' of the younger generation, striving after authenticity and wanting to be genuinely good instead of appearing to be good and 'breaking sharply with the old generation':

He refuses Phaedra because his deterrent is not fear of discovery and consequent scandal but moral abhorrence of the deed itself. It is ironic that Hippolytus patterns his life on what he imagines Artemis to be, while in fact the peevish goddess is no better than anyone else in the older generation. Hippolytus, however, manages in one sense to transcend his model because he himself is noble and capable of imagining a deity holier than exists. He creates god in his own image, imputing to that god his own purity.¹⁷¹

Marriage¹⁷²

In ancient Rome, unlike in our own day, marriage was not a legal contract, rather a social fact that came into being through being lived. Matrimony was mostly accompanied by various ceremonies and festivities, but they were not indispensable. The essential ingredient was the *affectio maritalis*, the commitment of the spouses to going through life together and to bringing legitimate offspring into the world (*liberorum creandorum causa*).

At an early period, it was the father who traditionally married off his son or daughter, but later on both partners—theoretically the daughter also—had to agree to the marriage. Nevertheless, it was often the case that husband and wife knew each other only slightly—or not at all—before their wedding-day. Almost nobody in antiquity questioned this state of affairs, any more than the fact that there was usually a great age-difference between the partners: the girl generally married in the early years of puberty, anywhere between 12 and 15, while the man was usually well into his twenties when he began the great adventure.¹⁷³

It is evident that man and woman would have had a totally different background at the moment of marriage: the girl would have spent most of her life indoors, usually with little intellectual training, cut off from the opposite sex; the boy, on the other hand, enjoyed a relatively high degree of freedom after assuming the male toga in about his fifteenth year, studied rhetoric and eloquence in his native city or in an intellectual centre far from home, and had opportunities enough to gain sexual experience by associating with girls (or boys) who did not qualify for legitimate marriage.

It ought to be noted in the present context that sex and love played a relatively unimportant role within marriage and were seen exclusively as the necessary means to acquiring children (usually a rather limited number).¹⁷⁴ What the present day understands as love was not only not an essential ingredient of marriage in the view of the Ancients, but was even deemed inappropriate. As we read in the *Augustan History*, ‘Wife is a term of honour, not of pleasure (*uxor enim dignitatis nomen est, non voluptatis*).’¹⁷⁵ In the same sense we read in the Church Father Jerome, who is quoting from Seneca: ‘He who loves his wife too passionately is an adulterer (*adulter*). Love for someone else’s spouse is a scandal in all cases, for one’s own spouse if too passionate. A wise man ought to love his wife with his reason, not

with his feelings (*sapiens vir iudicio debet amare coniugem, non affectu*). There is nothing more shocking than to love his wife as if she were a harlot.¹⁷⁶

Bearing in mind all that has been said so far, marriage was normally not very attractive. To use the words of R. O. A. M. Lyne:

In theory marriage might be the expression of a whole and satisfying love. In practice the rule was different. Fascinating exceptions to this rule can be adduced, and in the lower classes love marriages would be much commoner; but, in the upper classes, the rule basically holds good. By tradition, upper class marriage was at best an institution in which a man and woman could enjoy friendship, mutual respect and affection, and be partners in the maintenance of the *domus* and the propagation of the family. At worst its forms were a mockery, it might keep women in effective subservience, and it was often simply a cynical manoeuvre for money, power, or position. In no case was it likely to be, nor was it traditionally expected to be, an instigation of love in all love's aspects combining reciprocated passion and affection, and the rest.¹⁷⁷

Small wonder that many young (as well as not so young) people were far from enthusiastic about marriage and used every means open to them to escape from this 'nuisance' and 'tedious' drag. This is the case in comedies and love-poetry but certainly often also in reality, as is evident from the marriage-laws of Augustus.¹⁷⁸ As an example from a later period, we can refer to Augustine. From the age of 17 he lived with a girl from the lower orders, who, during the first year of their relationship, bore him a son known to us as Adeodatus ('given by God'). Once he reached his early thirties and became a teacher in Milan, his mother, Monica, insisted that he get married. A bride of good background with a considerable dowry was sought out for him in distant Carthage and actually found. Since the girl was not yet of marriageable age he had to wait for two years. Augustine, who appears to have loved his girl-friend very intensely, opposed this planned *mariage de raison* but ultimately gave way to social convention. His girl-friend was taken away from him because it was feared that she might persuade him to change his mind. While waiting for his bride (he never saw her), he immediately took a new girlfriend—he quite frankly claimed that he could not live without a

woman—but since shortly afterwards he converted to Christianity his projected marriage came to nothing.¹⁷⁹

Like Augustine, many other youngsters were seriously in love with a girl-friend before marrying, which they often did under parental pressure.¹⁸⁰ As we have seen, a pre-marital liaison of this kind did not necessarily harm a youth's reputation. Men, whose behaviour was too decadent, however, got themselves a bad name. It emerges from the pages of Apuleius, for instance, that conscientious parents were exceedingly reluctant to give their daughter in marriage to such a candidate. Thrasyllus was a young man 'born of good parentage, valiant in prowess, and rich in substance, but very much given and addicted to whore-hunting and continual revelling by broad day'.

When Charite had come to an age ripe for marriage he was amongst her chief suitors and very ardently sought her hand; but although he were a man more comely than the residue that wooed her, and also had riches abundantly to persuade her parents, yet because he was of evil fame, and a man of wicked manners and conversation, he had the repulse and was put off by Charite.¹⁸¹

It is evident from the cases of Augustine and Thrasyllus (and many others) that girls married very young. The minimum age of legal marriage for girls in Rome was 12. Some married even earlier, but such 'marriage' only received legal recognition once the girl was 12.¹⁸²

There can be no doubt that many girls at the age of 12 had not even reached puberty. That the practice in early Sparta with regard to marriage was different from that in Rome is apparent from the following remarkable quotation from Plutarch, who is referring to Lycurgus, the traditional founder of the Spartan constitution:

Lycurgus made young maidens brides only when they were fully ripe and eager for it, in order that intercourse with a husband, coming at a time when nature craved it, might produce a kindly love, instead of the timorous hate that follows unnatural compulsion.... The Romans, on the other hand, gave their maidens in marriage when they were twelve years old, or even younger. In this way more than any other, it was thought, both their bodies and their dispositions would

be pure and undefiled when their husbands took control of them. It is clear, therefore, that one practice [the Spartan] regarded nature more, with children in view; the other [the Roman] regarded more the formation of the character, with married life in view.¹⁸³

M.Durry, on the basis of this and other documents, has come to the conclusion that Romans indulged in the 'barbarous' custom of having sexual intercourse with wives who had not yet reached puberty.¹⁸⁴ One can doubt, however, whether his opinion is correct. Given that in marriage the husband could 'dispose' of his wife at will, sexual intercourse probably did occasionally take place before the female partner was physically mature. This was certainly not the rule, however, and it was not considered normal, as Durry seems to believe. In antiquity the man had sufficient opportunity for satisfying his sexual desires in extra-marital affairs; and marriage—as has been said earlier—had to do with status, not with pleasure, and was concerned almost exclusively with procreation. When a man did marry a girl who had not yet reached puberty, his primary motivation was to protect her virginity until she was able to bring children into the world.

Homosexuality¹⁸⁵

In Greece as well as in Rome, homosexual practices between adults were generally despised, but love for young boys (pederasty) was judged differently in East and in West. For the Romans, pederasty was a typically Greek phenomenon.¹⁸⁶ However, this did not mean at all that such relationships did not occur in the West, though they were often disdained. The Ancients were tolerant¹⁸⁷ but apart from that I think R.MacMullen is right when he distinguishes several degrees in that aversion:

Evidently least [detested] was the sexually active role with a boy-slave (slaves as instruments of pleasure being seen almost as non-beings, whether male or female); the same role with a free-born boy was in the second degree generally disapproved; in the third degree, the same role with a grown male, slave or free; in a passive role, as a youth, to an older freeborn man, fourth; for gain, or to a social inferior, fifth and sixth; and

even lower, other homosexual acts [*fellatio, irrumatio*] besides anal copulation.¹⁸⁸

In spite of the harsh punishments imposed in the army in the interests of discipline, homosexuality was without doubt commonly encountered in this milieu.¹⁸⁹ Cicero pointed the finger at the *gymnasia* as hotbeds of pederasty.¹⁹⁰ At school too young boys were not always safe: Quintilian issued warnings about immoral teachers, insisting on the practice of virtue and on segregated education for boys and youths.¹⁹¹ And, as Juvenal pointed out, parents of a handsome son lived in constant fear and misery: *filius autem/ corporis egregii miseros trepidosque parentes/ semper habet*.¹⁹²

In the case of pederasty, the older partner (the *erastes*, mostly between 20 and 40)¹⁹³ courted the younger (the *eromenos*). The former was the active partner, the latter the passive, and it was considered in Rome a great scandal when a free citizen took the passive role. Information about the age of such an *eromenos* we can deduce from the following Greek poem of Straton of Sardis (second century AD):

I delight in the prime of a boy of twelve, but one of thirteen is much more desirable. He who is fourteen is a still sweeter flower of the Loves, and one who is just beginning his fifteenth year is yet more delightful. The sixteenth year is that of the gods, and as for the seventeenth it is not for me, but for Zeus to seek it. But if one has a desire for those still older, he no longer plays, but now seeks 'And answering him back.'¹⁹⁴

For Straton the boy was thus between 12 and 17, but elsewhere 18 is mentioned as the limit.¹⁹⁵ In many cases the first appearance of facial hair alienated the lovers from one another,¹⁹⁶ yet there were some for whom the first down exercised a tremendous attraction.¹⁹⁷

Like the girl of good background, the free-born boy,¹⁹⁸ too, was often keen to defend his honour. From Quintilian we learn that in declamation exercises mention was frequently made of youngsters who committed suicide out of a sense of shame at having compromised their honour.¹⁹⁹ Well known is the story of Veturius (326 BC). To pay his father's debts, while still quite young (*adolescens*) he was handed over to a certain Plotius, who tried to seduce him. The seducer was imprisoned since, as Valerius Maximus writes, 'the chastity of someone with Roman blood must be

protected, irrespective of his social status (*in qualicumque enim statu positam Romano sanguini pudicitiam tutam esse voluit [senatus]*).²⁰⁰ From an early period too (226 BC) comes the story of Marcellus, a young man 'in the flower of youth and strikingly beautiful', who was courted by the *aedilis curulis* Capitolinus. The matter was brought before the senate, where the public official denied the charges. The victim was then called in. In shame, he kept his eyes downcast and did not open his mouth, yet, according to Plutarch, his blush, his tears, his shame and his contained anger were such eloquent testimony that Capitolinus was found guilty and heavily fined.²⁰¹

In later times too some youths behaved themselves in a similar way. Thus Cicero tells us the story of a contemporary young man who killed a military tribune because the latter had propositioned him: 'He preferred to do something dangerous rather than to undergo something disgraceful.'²⁰² But not all young men behaved similarly. One of the reasons for the *Lex Fannia* (161 BC) was that many free-born boys (*plerique ingenui pueri*) sold their freedom and chastity;²⁰³ and Tacitus, for his part, mentions scandalous amorous practices (*turpes amores*) as typical for the youth of his day,²⁰⁴ doubtless thinking of 'forbidden' homosexuality (as well as of adultery).

In invectives, the opponent is regularly accused of homosexual practices, whether rightly or wrongly. Sallust and Clodius were accused of having sold their bodies for money to the highest bidder; Catiline was accused of having used homosexual practices to rally the young round him; Cicero was accused of having paid for the lessons in eloquence he received from Piso with his chastity; Verres' son was said to have engaged in prostitution from a very early age; the young Caesar's stay at the king of Bithynia's court gave rise to dark rumours; and about Augustus we read in Suetonius:

In early youth he incurred the reproach of sundry shameless acts (*prima iuventa variorum dedecorum infamiam subiit*). Sextus Pompey taunted him with effeminacy; Mark Antony with having earned adoption by his uncle (Caesar) through unnatural relations; and Lucius, brother of Mark Antony, that after sacrificing his honour to Caesar he had given himself to Aulus Hirtius in Spain for three hundred thousand sesterces, and that he used to singe his legs with red-hot nutshells, to make the hair grow softer.²⁰⁵

For the Ancients a free-born young man (or girl) whose appearance was comely was quickly a topic of conversations, especially if he (or she) was of (high) rank. As W.A.Krenkel has shown,²⁰⁶ homosexual practices as *erastes* or *eromenos* belonged to the stock repertory of invectives, as well as an excessive sexual instinct, adultery, incest, prostitution, *fellatio*, *irrumatio*, tonguing. It is clear that all such reproaches ought to be taken with a pinch of salt.²⁰⁷ What they teach us is not so much what someone had actually done, but rather what was considered as within the bounds of the possible.

An example of a 'forbidden' relationship is the 'love romance' of Mark Antony and young Curio, described by Cicero at great length and in lively fashion in one of his *Philippics*. Fulminating against his arch-enemy Mark Antony, the great orator says the following:

You assumed a man's gown, and at once turned it into a harlot's (*sumpsisti virilem, quam statim muliebrem togam reddidisti*). At first you were a common prostitute (*vulgare scortum*), the fee for your infamies was fixed, and that not small; but Curio quickly turned up, who withdrew you from your meretricious traffic, and, as if he had given you a matron's robe, established you in an enduring and stable wedlock. No boy ever bought for libidinous purposes was ever so much in the power of his master as you were in Curio's. How often did his father eject you from his house, how often did he set watchmen that you might not cross his threshold, while you nevertheless, with night as your abettor, at the bidding of lust, and the compulsion of your pay, were let down through the tiles. These infamies that house could bear no longer. Do you know I am speaking of things well known to me? Recall that time when Curio the father, sick at heart, was lying on his bed: his son, throwing himself at my feet, with tears commended you to me; he implored me to defend you against his own father in case he should sue you for six million: for this, he said, was the amount for which he had become your surety. But for himself, in the ardour of his passion, he assured me he would go into exile, as he could not endure the regret of being parted from you. How great were the ills of a most prosperous family I at that time mitigated, or rather cured! I persuaded the father to discharge his son's debt; to redeem by his family resources a young man of the greatest promise both of heart and intellect; and by the rights

and authority of a father to keep him, not merely from familiarity, but even from meeting with you.²⁰⁸

Far more common than 'forbidden' homosexuality was the 'approved' version, i.e. sex with slaves who were often chosen for that specific purpose. Polybius reveals that as early as 168 BC such relationships were common among the degenerate youth of Rome and that extravagant sums were paid for a boy: 'This aroused the indignation of Cato, who said once in a public speech that it was the surest sign of deterioration in the republic when pretty boys fetch more than fields, and jars of caviar more than ploughmen.'²⁰⁹ A verse of Catullus suggests that, on marrying, a young man was supposed to break with his boy,²¹⁰ yet it is doubtful whether new spouses always did this.

One striking thing is that in antiquity a large number of people were apparently bisexual²¹¹ and felt equally attracted to boys and girls, Catullus' love for Lesbia, for instance, was challenged by his (fictitious?) affection for the boy Juventius. In the poet's misty eyes, this lad was the most beautiful who ever lived and ever would live. The poet was very anxious to protect Juventius' honour and chastity, but his favourite was snooty, he often baited, teased and humiliated his lover. Catullus was overcome with great jealousy when he discovered that his beloved was unfaithful and railed at his rivals without any reserve, since his love for his boy was insatiable: 'Your honeyed eyes, Juventius, if one should let me go on kissing still, I would kiss them three hundred thousand times, nor would I think I should ever have enough, no, not if the harvest of our kissing were thicker than the ripe ears of corn.'²¹²

By far the most celebrated *eromenos* of Roman antiquity was the often-portrayed Antinous,²¹³ who hailed from Bithynia. Hadrian, who was, more than any other emperor, influenced by Greek culture, fell under his spell. After his favourite's tragic death on an expedition on the Nile in AD 130 (some said he gave his life for his lover),²¹⁴ the emperor founded a city and called it Antinoöpolis after him, minted coins with his image on them, deified him, organized festivals and erected numerous statues in his memory.

So much for homosexuality in ancient Rome. It was often believed in the Roman world that men only sought intercourse with members of their own sex as a means of satisfying their 'carnal lust'. In many cases—just as in Greece—it was doubtless true, yet the examples of Catullus and Juventius, of Hadrian and Antinous, and of Antony

and Curio strike us as being passionate as well as genuine love relationships.

As everybody knows, Greek homosexuality, or rather pederasty, could have a strong spiritual—in theory not necessarily physical—dimension and educational value. An adolescent in the years of puberty—between 12 and 18—is loved by an older one (mostly a young man). The *erastes* wants to mould his partner to an ideal and to shine in his eyes, while the boy wants to emulate his lover and win his approval. Such ‘platonic love’ we find in the relationship between Marcus Aurelius and Fronto,²¹⁵ it is described also in Virgil’s famous story of Nisus and Euryalus which can be seen as an ode to youthful friendship. Both died in their attempt to break through the enemy ranks. Nisus was the elder and he nurtured a tender love (*amor pius*) for the 17-year-old Euryalus, ‘outstanding in beauty and freshness of youth’. He admired his younger friend’s physical and inner beauty; he wanted to prove his worth in his beloved’s eyes, he wanted to shine for him. Euryalus turned to his older friend for support and intimacy, wished not to short-change him in any respect, wished to prove himself a worthy ‘lover’ and desired to win fame at any price, even death.²¹⁶

Romantic love²¹⁷

It has been seen above how in prostitution the (young) man usually sought satisfaction of his instinctive desires, while in marriage sex and love played a subordinate role. It was nevertheless common for many young men to long for ‘real’ love, and Roman society offered him, from quite an early stage, opportunities to satisfy his heart’s desire. According to the contemporary historian Polybius,²¹⁸ from as early as 168 BC, in addition to the ‘common’ prostitute, Rome possessed courtesans, women with a degree of culture and education that neither the average prostitute nor the average wife possessed. On the other hand, one of the results of female emancipation was that some better-class women such as Clodia, Julia, Sempronia—ladies ‘who more often solicited men themselves than were solicited’²¹⁹—entered into competition with the ‘professionals’.

In this chapter, I am mainly using information from the comedians²²⁰ who wrote in the first half of the second century BC and from the poets of love²²¹ who were writing under the late Republic and the early Empire. It is uncertain how far the comedies of Plautus and Terence or the poems of these love-poets express the

social reality of their day,²²² but what most probably was exceptional at the time of Plautus and Terence had become a daily fact of life about a century later. As W.Kroll puts it,

this is of course in part due to the diversity of the poets themselves and of the inherited poetic motifs, but in part also to the cultural background provided by contemporary Rome. Here was a large circle of prosperous young people, whose chief occupation was to do nothing, and who were generally not inclined to marry, but who were driven by some remnant of Roman *gravitas* to enter into steady relationships. Furthermore, the suitable female parties for such relationships were available in Rome in larger numbers than anywhere else, since the considerable riches of the city acted as a strong magnet on adventuresses who came either from the East or from the more humble areas of Italo-Roman society.²²³

The awakening of young love is nowhere described in ancient literature more beautifully than in Longus' romance *Daphnis and Chloe*. Both protagonists were orphans, and had grown up together in a pastoral setting. Daphnis was 15, Chloe 13 when they discovered love. One day, when the young girl saw her friend taking a bath she experienced a strange feeling, could not understand what had come over her and became totally confused. In a beauty contest between Daphnis and the cowherd Dorkon, who was in love with Daphnis, Chloe selected Daphnis as winner, and then in a childish gesture, gave him a kiss, which was enough to set his heart on fire.

Daphnis, more like one that is bitten than kissed, was suddenly downcast and sad. He went often cold, and laid hand to his panting heart. He was fain to look upon Chloe, and yet looking was all on a blush. Then, too, for the first time he marvelled at her hair golden as fire, and her eyes great and gentle.... It was as if hitherto he had no eyes. And he would none of his meat but a taste in the mouth, nor yet of his drink, if drink he must, save so much as to wet his lips. He that prattled aforetime like a locust, opened not his mouth, he that used to be as resty and gadabout as a goat, sate ever still. His flock was neglected, his pipe flung aside, his cheeks grew paler than grass in season. For Chloe alone he found his tongue.²²⁴

Daphnis and Chloe had known each another for a long time before love arose, but as a rule in literature a young man fell in love at first sight. This was the case, for example, with the youthful brothers in Terence's *Phormio*. They had hardly attained their freedom—their father was travelling abroad—when Phaedria fell head over heels in love with a zither player. His brother Antiphon was a bit more restrained initially. Then one day a friend of his came along in tears to tell him that nearby he had seen an incredibly beautiful girl who was crying over her deceased mother. Antiphon went by to have a look and in an instant he had fallen hopelessly in love. The girl was free-born. In order to woo her he decided to marry her, even though she had no dowry to offer.²²⁵

What attracted a young lover above all was a girl's physical beauty. It seems unnecessary to remark that this beauty was often idealized, since as Quintilian points out, a lover is blind to a girlfriend's defects, or else is often of the opinion that it is precisely they that give her her special charm.²²⁶ Every (young) lover is convinced that his girl is the most beautiful there is and feels that in the very contemplation of his beloved he is transported into seventh heaven.²²⁷ Usually, too, blinded as he is by love, he is of the opinion that his girl is of sterling character.²²⁸ It is furthermore considered important for a girl to have refined manners, to be able to dance, play a musical instrument and be familiar with contemporary literature.²²⁹

It was not unusual for a young man to fall in love with an older or married woman. Ovid found 35 the ideal age. The beauty characteristic of the flower of youth may have faded somewhat, but such a partner has much more experience than a young girl, who cannot hope to know the tricks of the trade when it comes to love-making.²³⁰ From Horace's diatribe against the suitors of married women,²³¹ we learn about still other motives which urge an adulterer. Curiosity drives him on: one can only see the face of a *matrona*, and so his imagination runs away with him. This type of relationship was strictly forbidden and was full of potential danger, but that was precisely what made it so tempting, for, as Ovid so strikingly puts it, 'What is permitted, has no charm, what is forbidden, urges more fervently' (*quod licet ingratum est; quod non licet acrius urit*).²³² All these motives doubtless played an important role. And yet they do not explain everything. A young man can be genuinely in love with an older woman—one thinks, for example, of Catullus and his Lesbia, who was his senior by ten years. It is possible

that a young man felt himself attracted by such a woman on account of the feelings of tenderness, attachment and security he hoped she might provide.

The most remarkable characteristic of youthful love is its emotional vehemence. It was Ovid who pointed out that, on account of their age, the young burned with love (*aetate et amore calentes*), while older suitors were consumed with a slower fire (*ignis lenti*).²³³ The stress and strain which love caused had their physiological side-effects. 'All lovers have to appear pale', wrote Ovid, and there is hardly a lover (remember Daphnis) who is not described as having a pale (or blushing) appearance.²³⁴ The confusion caused by love is described by Catullus most beautifully in a poem which, although the young poet is imitating Sappho, certainly voices his own emotions:

He seems to me to be equal to a god, he, if it may be, seems to surpass the very gods, who sitting opposite you again and again gazes at you and hears you sweetly laughing.

Such a thing takes away all my senses, alas! For whenever I see you, Lesbia, at once no sound of voice remains within my mouth, but my tongue falters, a subtle flame steals down through my limbs, my ears ring with inward humming, my eyes are shrouded in twofold night.²³⁵

Love is often described as a sort of madness: *amantes, amentes*.²³⁶ When it comes to love it is impossible to preserve moderation. In vain does the lover try to sort out his confusion. Even though he knows full well how he ought to act, love exerts irresistible pressure. The more pressure is exerted upon him, the more intensely burns his love. The man who was once reason itself suddenly totally loses control of himself. He becomes completely gullible, he swallows everything his girl-friend tells him, even the most blatant lies, so long as she tells him what he wants to hear. He cares for neither his money nor his good name; everything must go. Love is not only blind, it severely curtails freedom, as Propertius puts it so well: 'Since no lover any more stays free, the man who chooses to love must give up all thought of liberty (*libertas quoniam nullaliam restat amanti, nullus liber erit, si quis amare volet*).'²³⁷

The young man who is head over heels in love will try to conquer his beloved. He will court her, will virtually become her shadow. When he cannot actually get near her, he is still overjoyed if he

catches a glimpse of her. He contrives to meet her by accident, to proffer her his hand, to brush against her and to imitate her in all she does. So as to curry her favour, he pays a lot of attention to the way he dresses. He expresses his admiration in highly romanticized letters and poems. Winks and smiles transmit his pleasure; no pet-name is sufficiently affectionate. Letters received from the beloved, as well as her portrait, are jealously preserved. Her way of dressing, her appearance, everything she says or does is the epitome of good taste and transports the suitor into ecstasy.²³⁸

Unfortunately for the lover, many girls are totally oblivious to such attention and adulation, as is understandable given the low social status of most of them. All they really desire are gifts, or they hope their lover may purchase their freedom. For his part the young man makes every effort to accommodate and even anticipate his beloved's desires, regardless of how crazy they might be. Money has to be acquired at all costs, by legal or illegal means. If a father is not vigilant, all his money vanishes into the pockets of his son's girl-friend.²³⁹

Courtship is not without serious hiccoughs: the lover has many an obstacle in his path. A suspicious father or spouse, a nurse or foster-mother, or an unscrupulous pimp will keep an eagle eye on the beloved. Yet love is resourceful, a way out is always found. The vigilante is either bamboozled or bought off, or, if these devices fail, the lover will still manage to enter the house stealthily through a window, a hole in the wall, the garden or the roof.²⁴⁰

In a case where the young man is given the cold shoulder by his beloved, he takes to the streets at night, facing hail, rain or snow and lighting his way with a torch to serenade his unreachable beloved in a *paraklausithyron* (the lament of the lover at the closed door).²⁴¹ Pursuit of the beloved is not always so peaceful; it is not always a matter of languishing sentiments. It can happen that a scorned young man who finds the entrance barred forces the door, using crowbars if necessary, abducts the girl (certainly not always against her will either), roughs up the inhabitants and, if any credence can be attached to what poets tell us, sets the house on fire.²⁴² Girls too acquit themselves well in this field, for, as Seneca writes, it is delightful if a girl knocks at the door, but still more delightful if she rams the gate (*quae si impulit, grata est; gratior si effregit*).²⁴³

The young man feels he has reached the peak of happiness, he feels himself equal to a god, once he has won 'his' girl. A true lover,

we hear, loves the beloved more than himself, and it does not matter to him that such feeling is not in keeping with the Roman idea of *gravitas*. His beloved is more precious to him than his own eyes; he would rather give up loving his parents— or even himself—than stop loving her; he would almost prefer to shorten his own life if only he could lengthen hers.²⁴⁴

People who love each other keep no secrets from each other and together they form one soul in two bodies. The beloved is the only human being that matters, is the very centre of existence. When she is around, friends, other girls, relatives, in fact all else vanishes into thin air.²⁴⁵ Propertius is certainly no exceptional case when writing about his Cynthia the following, provocative words:

You alone are my home, Cynthia, you alone my parents, you are my every moment of happiness. Whether I am downcast or joyful when I meet my friends, I shall tell them, whatever my mood: 'Cynthia was the cause' (*Cynthia causa fuit*);

You are my only joy: be I your only joy, Cynthia: this love means more to me than the name of father (*hic erit et patrio nomine pluris amor*);

Never shall wife, never shall mistress part us; you shall ever be mistress, ever be wife to me (*nos uxor numquam, numquam me ducet amica:/semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris*).²⁴⁶

When a real lover is separated from his beloved, he has her picture constantly in his mind's eye or her name ringing in his ears. He dreams about her at night, and it can happen that he cries out her name in his sleep so that he betrays his most intimate feelings. To be constantly in her presence, to hear her or to lay eyes on her is indescribable sweetness. The young man knows no happiness in her absence; without her neither poetry, the theatre, nor parties, in short nothing, affords him pleasure or distraction. Every separation is positive torture; he cannot bear to miss her for so much as a single day; without her life is simply devoid of meaning; for, as Plautus writes, 'his love is life to a lover; if she's away, he's lost (*animast amica amanti; si abest, nullus est*)'.²⁴⁷

No Roman poet experienced love and knew how to express his feelings as eloquently and touchingly as Catullus. The passion which fired his love and its unquenchable fire are evident from the following poem:

Let us live, my Lesbia, and love, and value at one farthing all the talk of crabbed old men (*rumoresque senum severiorum*).

Suns may set and rise again. For us, when the short light has once set, remains to be slept the sleep of one unbroken night.

Give me a thousand kisses, then a hundred, then another thousand, then a second hundred, then yet another thousand, then a hundred. Then, when we have made up many thousands, we will confuse our counting, that we may not know the reckoning, nor any malicious person blight them with evil eye, when he knows that our kisses are so many.²⁴⁸

Young love is certainly passionate, but it can also be very tender. Catullus contrasts *amare*, to love physically, with *bene velle*, to be benevolent, and remembers with melancholy how he loved his dearest Lesbia the way a father might love his sons (*pater ut gnatos diligit*).²⁴⁹ We find a similar tenderness in Propertius' poems. Cynthia has neither brother nor son, yet the poet desires to be both a brother and a son to her (*frater ego et tibi sim filius unus ego*).²⁵⁰ As long as Corinna did not put her love up for sale, Ovid loved her—her body, but also her soul (*animum cum corpore amavi*).²⁵¹ In Terence also most youths show a similar tenderness. Thus Pamphilus, for example, who refused to swap his beloved for a wife: 'I swear by all that's sacred that I will never forsake her, not if I knew that I must face the enmity of the whole world. I wooed her, I won her, our hearts are one; away with those that would part us; death only shall take her from me.'²⁵²

It goes without saying that lovers quarrelled from time to time. Passions tend to be easily aroused, particularly among the young. Threats are made, cheeks are scratched, clothes torn, doors slammed.²⁵³ By the time tempers have cooled and composure has been regained, there are deep regrets about what has been said and done. Such quarrels are usually of short duration and, as Terence writes, 'lover's quarrels are love's renewal (*amantium irae amoris integratiost*)'.²⁵⁴

The youthful lover is often tormented by jealousy and cannot bear that another comes close to his idol. Propertius tells the story of how he went to spy on Cynthia at night to see whether or not she was faithful.²⁵⁵ For Catullus no words are bad enough to articulate his vituperation for rivals in love.²⁵⁶ Lucretius describes the lover

who kept an eagle eye on his girl-friend and got very worried were she to glance longingly at another man or smile at him.²⁵⁷

Someone who is genuinely in love will want to keep his girl for himself. His feelings are genuine, and it is his firm hope that his love will last the rest of time. Propertius is certainly not the only one who dreams of an eternal love,²⁵⁸ yet his poetry best illustrates youthful exclusivity and fidelity. His epitaph, he says, will read: 'Who now is buried here as gruesome dust, once was the slave of a single love (*unius hic quondam servus amoris erat*).'²⁵⁹ One single woman managed to monopolize all his affections. Somewhat naively, he believed that in his love there was place for quarrels, but not for infidelity. Only death will separate him from his beloved. Cynthia was his first love, she will be his last: *Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit*.²⁶⁰

Love can be the source of inexhaustible happiness, yet it can also be the cause of immense pain. The misery which accompanies love has often been described. The lover is tormented by his feelings; he feels he is the most wretched of mortals, can find no rest, does not know what he really wants, has no longer any control over himself, does precisely what he ought not to do. The young man tortured by love can no longer eat nor drink, goes round pale as a sheet, is unable to sleep, dissolves regularly in tears, neglects his appearance, and pesters the life out of everyone (even everything!) with his endless talks about his misery. He is utterly sick of life, he cherishes his 'illness' and does not really want recovery. He is obsessed by suicidal thoughts, and his misery is so intense that he visibly pines away; he loses weight and gets sick. If Propertius is to be believed, there were many who actually died of love.²⁶¹

Many sought to escape from a love which threatened to destroy them. They took refuge in wine or the services of prostitutes, fled the place which reminded them of their girl-friend, moved to another city or joined the army.²⁶² In the final analysis, 'reason' normally won the upper hand over 'feelings', and the lover ceded to the will of his father, who insisted on a 'respectable' marriage.²⁶³ This was not, however, the case as far as Catullus was concerned: despite his deep longing to get married, it was not possible for him to marry Lesbia. His love for his *divina puella*²⁶⁴ may have brought him much happiness, but it also plunged him into deep misery, which ultimately made his situation unbearable. In two of his poems he attempted to make a clean break with her. The use of his rational powers alone could not release him from his passion

(*carmen* 8), so he finally turned to the gods, addressing to them a prayer for help:

If a man can take any pleasure in recalling the thought of kindnesses done, when he thinks that he has been a true friend (*pius*); and that he has not broken sacred faith (*fides*), nor in any compact (*foedus*) has used the majesty of the gods in order to deceive men, then there are many joys in a long life for you, Catullus, earned from this thankless love. For whatever kindness man can show to man by word or deed has been said and done by you. All this was entrusted to an ungrateful heart, and is lost: why then should you torment yourself now any more? Why do you not settle your mind firmly, and draw back, and cease to be miserable, in despite of the gods?

It is difficult suddenly to lay aside a long-cherished love. It is difficult; but you should accomplish it, one way or another. This is the only safety, this you must carry through, this you are to do, whether it is possible or impossible.

Ye gods, if mercy is your attribute (*si vestrumst misereri*), or if ye ever brought aid to any at the very moment of death, look upon me in my trouble, and if I have led a pure life (*si vitam puriter egi*), take away this plague and ruin from me. Ah me! what a lethargy creeps into my inmost joints, and has cast out all joys from my heart! No longer is this my prayer, that she should love me in return, or, for that is impossible, that she should consent to be chaste (*esse pudica*). I would myself be well again and put away this baleful sickness (*taetrum morbum*).

O ye gods, grant me this in return for my piety (*o di, reddite mi hoc pro pietate mea*).²⁶⁵

CONCLUSION

Our journey in search of the young Roman has come to an end. A few concluding remarks are in order.

As was emphasized in the Introduction, this study has concentrated on young men of wealthy background, passing over their female contemporaries and young people from a lower social class in virtually total silence. It is certainly not because the latter are of little or no interest, but because the surviving source-material sheds little light on the way they spent their youth. There is good reason to believe that their youth was very different from that of the youngsters dealt with in this study who had plenty of money, freedom, and leisure.

It will have struck the attentive reader that the concept of ‘youth’ in this study is not always the same. Sometimes it refers to the younger generation *vis-à-vis* their elders, sometimes to children and youths together, sometimes to young people between about 15 and 25–30. In theoretical subdivisions of the human lifespan the Romans normally did not further sub-classify this age (the *adulescentia* or *iuventus*), but that does not prevent the present work from devoting considerable attention to youngsters between 14 and 21, for which period of life the Greeks often used the word *μειράκιον*. It was they who lived their youth to the full and who best exemplify what it meant to be young in ancient Rome.

In Cicero’s view, ‘hot-headedness’ (*ferocitas*) was what most typified the young and, indeed, time and time again we find a young man labelled with this epithet. He is a hot-head in his speech, his poetry, his attitude to his elders, his street behaviour, his conduct on the sports-field, in the forum, on the battlefield, in politics, as a student. And yet the epithet ‘hot-headed’ does not provide an exhaustive characterization of youth in general. There were also youngsters who were dreamers, romantics, idealists, fanatics, who

were hyper-sensitive, enthusiastic, creative, pleasure-loving. Hot-headedness was thus in many cases combined with other characteristics, yet the dominant feature still remained the *ferocitas* which drove a young man to both good and evil, virtue and vice.

This book covers a period of about 700 years. Society in the ancient world was much more static than in our day, yet it goes without saying that it underwent a significant evolution between c. 200 BC and c. AD 500. The prevailing image of youth changed together with society. The way in which the young realized their concrete projects and ambitions was determined by the social context and the spirit of the era. The same enduring characteristics were not always expressed in the same way in each generation. In the period before 200 BC, for example, youth (*iuventus*) constituted a formally defined social class. Between the ages of 17 and 46 young men were responsible for the defence of the fatherland. The years around 200 BC were an important turning-point. Rome's world domination was a *fait accompli*; all sorts of Greek influences determined the Roman way of life. The *Lex Villia annalis* (180 BC) was designed to keep youngsters out of political office; the *Lex Plaetoria* (c. 200 BC) imposed restrictions, perhaps not in theory but certainly in practice, on the financial independence of a young man up to his twenty-fifth birthday. A rift thus came into being between a youth's physical and his social maturity. Theoretically, a young man was considered an adult after being clothed with the adult toga at the age of about 16, but in practice he had to wait until he was well into his twenties before he was really taken *au sérieux*. A temporal space was thus created between childhood and (real) adulthood which made the age we know as youth possible. From that moment on the prodigal youngster, the reveller, the lover, the dandy are constant figures in the Roman world, even if their behaviour differs from period to period.

Despite partial marginalization, the social involvement of youth in the Republic was quite intense. Military service did not exercise the same attraction as before, but politics continued to cast their spell, and many were the youths who initiated spectacular litigation on the forum to prove their own worth to the community. There were many youths who supported 'conservative' statesmen, but there were also many who rallied behind revolutionary politicians who advocated radical changes in society. A number of young poets, for their part, broke with traditional Roman values and with a society which in their eyes was corrupt and sick. They proclaimed a new life-style in which

love and poetry, connected with a nostalgia for a better world free of war, would be their central concerns.

Augustus dealt the death-blow to the Republic at the battle of Actium in 31 BC. The new regime 'constructed' a new state of human affairs. Under the Empire eloquence moved from the forum to the schoolroom; politics were no longer the highest ambition of every right-minded Roman of the higher classes. The citizens of the day, and young men in particular, started looking for new ways to give some sense and direction to their lives. Many went hell for leather into a whirl of often not exemplary leisure activities, while others attempted to inject into their lives deeper, more spiritual values. Eloquence still represented for many the crowning of human achievement, even though it had lost much of its practical usefulness. The young's thirst for knowledge extended to a wide variety of disciplines—history, law, medicine, grammar—but the only serious contender rhetoric had was philosophy. There were many who were fascinated by beautiful language or the skills of dialectic, for them the perfect way to show off their brilliance. For others, philosophy was something they took in deadly earnest. 'Conversions' in the years of early youth were not at all exceptional. The young man sought—and could find—in philosophy a spiritual foothold, a guide for living, an answer to his questions about life and death. No wonder that another characteristic trait was a predilection for the ascetic life.

While one can justifiably consider the youth of the late Republic in a certain sense revolutionary, the youth of the Empire was, generally speaking, more serious. Many young Romans would have agreed with Longfellow that 'Life is real, life is earnest'. Of course this maxim did not apply to all the young. Many 'students', for example, as we know them from the later Empire, often took neither life—nor their studies—particularly seriously. Their general behaviour makes it abundantly clear that youth can form a subculture, a somewhat closed world with its own norms, standards and values.

One final point is worth recalling by way of conclusion. There was a striking contrast between the 'theoretical' conceptions the ancients had of youth and the way in which young men behaved in practice. There is constant reference in theory to the passions, the instincts, the lusts of the young. In practice, however, the picture is not so grim: we regularly encounter unselfishness, integrity, courage, heroism, desire for purity, etc. It goes without saying that we encounter positive and negative characteristics in other age-

groups too; it was due to *ferocitas* that these traits manifested themselves most acutely during the years of a man's youth.

NOTES

jR in the notes refers to my book *De jonge Romein volgens de literaire bronnen der periode ca. 200 v. Chr. tot ca. 500 n. Chr.*, Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1977.

INTRODUCTION

- 1 Cf. C.N. Degler (1975) 5–6: The definition of history is a changing thing: there is nothing sacred about its content. Today fields of history once central to the subject—like constitutional history—are quite peripheral, while urban history, or black history, once barely known, have pushed to the fore. The definition, or, more accurately, the content of history, will change as we ask where the women [or the youths] have been.’
- 2 Cf. E. Eyben (1991) 225–55.
- 3 Cf. D.M. Halperin (1990) 2: ‘Within the last two decades, especially, political movements originating outside the academy have so transformed life within it that a classical scholar who studies ancient Greek sexual practices, including paederasty (the ‘unspeakable’ vice) ...can expect not only to be tolerated by the profession but to be materially rewarded by it as well.’
- 4 All other books on Roman youth are from a recent date. Cf. J.-P. Néraudau (1979), who deals mainly with youth from the period before 200 BC; L.Giuliano (1979), who studies some aspects of republican youth; M. Kleijwegt (1991), whose mainly epigraphical study—which appeared when the text of this book was substantially complete—focuses on *some* aspects of youth (especially politics) in the cities of the Graeco-Roman world under the Empire. For a bibliography on child and youth in antiquity, cf. M.Karras/J.Wiesehöfer (1981).
- 5 Cf. G.R.Lambert (1982) 56 n. 7: ‘Rather full quotations have often been given for the reason stated by A.O.Lovejoy in his now virtually classic statement of what is involved in the study of history of ideas

(*The Great Chain of Being*, 1936, p. ix): "...In my own reading I have often been exasperated by finding *précis* or para phrases where I desiderated the actual language of the authors whose ideas were under consideration: and my rule has therefore been to give the words of relevant texts as fully as was consistent with reasonable brevity".'

I YOUTH AS A DISTINCT AGE OF MAN

- 1 Cf. *JR* 62–128. An earlier version of this chapter appeared as E. Eyben (1987).
- 2 J.H. Van den Bergh (1956); Ph. Ariès (1960).
- 3 F. Musgrove (1968) 13ff. ('Making adolescents'); 33ff. (The invention of the adolescent'). These views influenced classical scholars such as H.W. Pleket (1979) 173–92 and M. Kleijwegt (1991), who founded their thesis mainly on epigraphical material. On this inspiring—but in my eyes incorrect—point of view, cf. E. Eyben (1981a) 328–50.
- 4 A. Kriekemans (1967) 298.
- 5 Cf. *JR*. 65ff.; E. Eyben (1981b) 133–40; (1981a) 328–50.
- 6 Cf. *JR*. 5–40. On age qualification in (Roman) antiquity, cf. F. Boll (1950) 156–224; E. Eyben (1973b) 150–90; D. Sluanski (1974) 103–21, 267–96, 345–69, 437–51, 563–78; W. Suder (1978) 5–9.
- 7 Varro, in Censorinus, 14, 2. Cf. *JR* 21ff.; D. Sluanski (1973) 103–9. Important also is Isidore of Seville, *Orig.*, 11, 2, 2ff. (a division of the human life-span based on the number seven; youth lasts from 14 until 28). Cf. *JR* 25ff.
- 8 Cf. pp. 42ff. Therefore *iuventus* during the Republic almost always refers to young people as a class rather than to an age.
- 9 Cf. B. Axelson (1948) 7ff. In late antiquity, however, Church Fathers such as Ambrose and—especially—Augustine apparently distinguish *adulescens* (from 15 until 30) and *iuvenis* (from 30 until 45). Cf. *JR* 35–7. Important also is the fact that Plautus and Terence always use *adulescens* (or *adulescentia*) and that poets from Catullus on (almost) always use *iuvenis* (or *iuventus*).
- 10 Cf. H. Harmon (1978) 1596–8; G. Amiotti (1981) 131–40; E. Eyben (1985) 412ff.; T.E. J. Wiedemann (1989) 114–17.
- 11 Cf. W.W. Fowler (1896) 317–19; E. Eyben (1986) 331–2.
- 12 Cf. pp. 19ff.
- 13 Cf. pp. 21–2.
- 14 On the *Lex [P]laetoria* and the *minor aetas*, cf. S. Solazzi (1912); E. Weiss (1931) 578–82; A. Berger (1932) 1860–89; G. Wesener (1974) 571–81; S. di Salvo (1979); E. Eyben (1981a) 329–31; (1985) 426–8; J.-P. Néraudau (1979) 106ff.; L. Giuliano (1979) 73ff. Cf. B. Perrin (1966) 1455–65 (the situation in criminal law). It seems strange to me

- that M. Kleijwegt (1991) nowhere in his book on Roman youth mentions the *Lex [P]laetoria* or the *cura minorum*.
- 15 Plautus, *Pseud.*, 303–4 (transl. P. Nixon).
 - 16 *Theodosian Code*, 2, 17 (transl. C. Pharr). Neither H.W. Pleket (1979) nor M. Kleijwegt (1991) mentions the *minor aetas* and the *venia aetatis* in his discussion of adolescence/youth in the Roman world.
 - 17 Cf. A. Afzelius (1946–7) 263–78; P. Fraccaro (1957) 207–34; A.E. Astin (1958); G. Rögler (1962) 76–123. Cf. J.-P. Néraudau (1979) 116ff.; L. Giuliano (1979) 73ff.; E. Eyben (1981a) 331–2; (1985) 428–9; T. Wiedemann (1989) 119.
 - 18 Dio, 52, 20, 1 (transl. E. Cary). The same age-reduction was introduced for inclusion in the lists of the *iudices* (cf. E. Eyben (1981a) 332) and for the municipal magistracies (*ibid.*, 338–9).
 - 19 Cf. pp. 126, 150.
 - 20 Seneca, *Contr.*, 2, 6, 11 (transl. M. Winterbottom).
 - 21 Cf. *JR* 62–6.
 - 22 Seneca, *Ep.*, 121, 15–17. The transition from one age to another is seen as radical ('a dying', e.g. Marcus Aurelius, 9, 21, 2; 'a growing into something else', Seneca, *Ep.*, 118, 14; cf. p. 11) or gradual (e.g. Augustine, *Ep.*, 4, 1 PL 33, 66). Cf. E. Eyben (1973a) 225ff.; C. Gnifka (1977) 5ff.
 - 23 Most important for youth is puberty: cf. *JR* 41–61; E. Eyben (1972b) 677–97.
 - 24 Cicero, C.M., 10, 33 (transl. W.A. Falconer). Cf. *ibid.*, 20, 76: 'Boyhood has certain pursuits (*studia certa*): does youth (*adulescentes*) yearn for them? Early youth (*ineuns aetas*) has its pursuits: does the matured or so-called middle stage of life (*ea constans aetas, quae media dicitur*) need them? Maturity, too, has such as are not even sought in old age, and finally, there are those suitable to old age'. Cf. *JR* 62–3.
 - 25 Cf. Cicero, *De or.*, 1, 52, 233: *venas cuiusque generis, aetatis, ordinis*; Pliny, *Ep.*, 10, 96, 9: *omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus*; Suetonius, *Cal.*, 4: *populi Romani sexum, aetatem, ordinem omnem*; Tertullian, *Apol.*, 1, 1, 7 CCL 1, 86: *omnem sexum, aetatem, condicionem, etiam dignitatem*; Virg. *vel.*, 8, 2 CCL 2, 1218: *omnis generis, omnis ordinis, omnis condicionis, omnis dignitatis, omnis aetatis*; Bapt., 18, 4 CCL 1, 293: *pro cuiusque personae condicione ac dispositione, etiam aetate*; Salvian, *Eccl.*, 3, 44 CSEL 8: *omnis aetas, omnis condicio*. Cf. Tertullian, *Nat.*, 1, 16, 7 CCL 1, 35: *aetatis ac sexus necessitate*.
 - 26 Plautus, *Merc.*, 984 (transl. P. Nixon). Cf. *JR* 63 nn. 5–6.
 - 27 Seneca, *Contr.*, 2, 6, 4 (transl. M. Winterbottom). Cf. *JR* 64 with nn. 7–10.

- 28 Cicero, C.M., 11, 38: 'For just as I approve of the young man in whom there is a touch of age (*adulescentem in quo est senile aliquid*), so I approve of the old man in whom there is some of the flavour of youth (*senem in quo est aliquid adulescentis*)' (transl. W. A.Falconer). Cf. Ambrose, *Ep.*, 63, 98 PL 16, 1245, and *JR* 64–5 n. 11.
- 29 Cf. *JR* 64–6 and nn. 12–14. Cf. W.Hartke (1972) 220ff.; T.C.Carp (1980) 736–9; C.Gnilka (1972) *passim*; T.Wiedemann (1989) *passim*.
- 30 Quintilian, 2, 4, 9 (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 31 Menander, quoted in Plutarch, *Cons. Ap.*, 34, 119E. Cf. Homer, *Od.*, 15, 245–7; Seneca, *Marc.*, 12, 3; 23, 3–5; Quintilian, 6 Pr. 10; Fronto, *Nep. am.*, 5. Cf. *JR* 66 n. 17.
- 32 Seneca, *Marc.*, 23, 3–5 (transl. J.W. Basore).
- 33 Cf. *JR* 66–80.
- 34 Cf. *JR* 66–71; E.Eyben (1971) 77–104.
- 35 Cf. E.Eyben (1985) 403ff.
- 36 Ps.-Plutarch, *Plac. phil.*, 5, 23, 909CD. Cf. *JR* 28 n. 82; 66–7 with n. 23. For physiological explanations (the warmth of the blood or the dryness of the body), cf. Isidore of Seville, *Orig.*, 11, 2, 27. Cf. *JR* 68–9 with nn. 25–7.
- 37 Seneca, *Ep.*, 118, 14 (transl. R.M.Gummere). Cf. *JR* 68 n. 24.
- 38 Jerome, *Eccl.*, 4, 13/16 CCSL 72,288.
- 39 Augustine, *Ep.*, 180, 2 PL 33, 778; *Gen. litt.*, 10, 13 CSEL 28, 1, 311. Cf. *JR* 67–8 with n. 24.
- 40 Tertullian, *An.*, 38, 1–2 CCSL 2, 840–1. Cf. the comment of J.W. Waszink, *ad locum*, and E.Eyben (1985) 410–11.
- 41 Plato, *Phil.* 6, 15D–16A (transl. H.N.Fowler). Cf. A.Bork (1961) 74ff.
- 42 Xenophon, *Mem.*, 2, 1, 21ff.; Cicero, *Off.*, 1, 32, 117–18. Cf. *JR* 69–71 and E.Eyben (1970) 1–20; (1971) 80ff.
- 43 E.g. Lactantius, *Div. inst.*, 6, 3, 6ff. CSEL 19,486. Bibliography as in n. 42.
- 44 Cf. Cicero, *Off.*, 1, 32, 117–18: *ineunte enim adulescentia...cum primum pubesceret*. Cf. *JR* 70 n. 34.
- 45 Cicero, *Off.*, 1, 32, 118. Cf. *JR* 70 n. 35. The 'thinking' youthful Lysiteles in Plautus, *Trin.*, 223ff. parodies young Heracles. Cf. *JR* 70–1 with n. 36.
- 46 Cf. *JR* 72–80.
- 47 Horace, A.P., 163 (cf. pp. 36–7).
- 48 Therefore the *adulescentia* is a *suspecta aetas*. Cf. Valerius Maximus, 8, 1, 12 and *JR* 72 n. 39.
- 49 Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 16, 12AC (transl. F.C.Babbitt). Cf. Iamblichus, *V.Pyth.*, 31, 202–3. A lad needs greater supervision than a child. Such a text proves that one cannot speak of 'the absence of

- adolescence', as H.W.Pleket (1979) 173–92 and M.Kleijwegt (1991) do.
- 50 Ambrose, *Iob*, 1, 7, 21 CSEL 32, 2, 224: *adulescentia sola est invalida viribus, infirma consiliis, vitio calens, fastidiosa monitoribus, inlecebrosa deliciis*. Cf. *jR* 73 n. 43.
- 51 John Chrysostom, *Matt.*, 81, 5 PG 58, 737 (transl. P. Schaff). Cf. *jR* 73 n. 44.
- 52 Cf. John Chrysostom, *Matt.*, 81, 5 PG 58, 737 (cf. p. 15); Florus, 1, 17, 9 (*fretum illud adolescentiae*); *Latin Panegyrics*, 5, 5, 4 (*in mediis adolescentiae fluctibus*); John Chrysostom, *Ep. I ad Tim.*, 9, 2 PG 62, 546 (an untamed horse); Seneca, *Phoen.*, 353 (*iuvenum furor*). Cf. *jR* 73 n. 44, 74 n. 47.
- 53 Cicero, *Cael.*, 31, 75; 17, 41 (transl. R. Gardner).
- 54 E.g. Tacitus, *Ann.*, 6, 55, 3; 13, 2, 2; 14, 56, 2. Cf. *jR* 74 n. 49, 75 n. 51.
- 55 E.g. Jerome, *Ep.*, 79, 7. Cf. *jR* 74 n. 48 and 50.
- 56 E.g. *Digest*, 4, 4, 11, 5; *Codex Iustinianus*, 2, 22, 1; 2, 35, 2.
- 57 Cf. 75–80; E.Eyben (1991) 116ff.
- 58 E.g. Suetonius, *Nero*, 26, 1. Cf. *jR* 75 n. 52.
- 59 Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 16, 12AC (cf. p. 14).
- 60 Pliny, *Ep.*, 3, 3, 4.
- 61 So, e.g. Attia, the mother of Octavianus. Cf. Nicolaus of Damascus, *V. Caes.*, 4 (ed. C.M.Hall). But see Ps.-Quintilian, *Decl.*, 338 p. 333; Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 16, 12AC (cf. p. 14); John Chrysostom, *Matt.*, 81, 5 PG 58, 737 (cf. p. 15).
- 62 *Vitium aetatis*, cf. n. 58 and n. 91; *error adolescentiae*, cf. Ps.-Quintilian, *Decl. min.*, 290 p. 159, and *jR* 75 n. 54; *lapsus iuvenum*, cf. Statius, *Silv.*, 1, 2, 100, and *jR* 75 n. 55; *ludus aetatis*, cf. Cicero, *Cael.*, 18, 42, and *jR* 76 n. 56; *iuvenalis iocus*, cf. Livy, 5, 22, 5, and *jR* 76 n. 57.
- 63 E.g. Seneca, *Contr.*, 2, 6, 11. Cf. *jR* 77 n. 68.
- 64 Cf. p. 29 with n. 136.
- 65 Cicero, *Cael.*, 12, 28. Cf. *jR* 76 n. 58. For some restrictions of the *concessum aetati*, cf. Cicero, *Cael.*, 18, 42 and E.Eyben (1991) 128.
- 66 E.g. Terence, *Ad.*, 101–2. Cf. *jR* 77 n. 63.
- 67 E.g. Plautus, *Pseud.*, 434–5. Cf. *jR* 77 nn. 64–5.
- 68 E.g. Tacitus, *Ann.*, 13, 12, 1ff.; 14, 14, 4.
- 69 Cicero, *Cael.*, 19, 44. Cf. *jR* 77 n. 67.
- 70 Cf. *jR* 78 nn. 71–2.
- 71 Cicero, *Cael.*, 18, 42 (transl. R. Gardner).
- 72 Syrus, 566: *quod aetas vitium posuit aetas auferet*. But see *ibid.*, 649: 'Wisdom is found by sense, not years (*sensus, non aetas, invenit sapientiam*)' (transl. J.W.Duff).

- 73 Cf. A.Otto (1962) s.v. *frux*. Cf. expressions such as *redire in viam* (cf. p. 115), *resipiscere*. Cf. *jR* 78 with n. 78.
- 74 Cicero, *Cael.*, 12, 28; 18, 43 (transl. R. Gardner). Cf. *jR* 78 n. 73. For the plea of youth (a *locus indulgentiae*), cf. *jR* 76 nn. 60–1.
- 75 Cf. Plutarch, *Them.*, 2, 5 (the most stubborn foals will be the best horses); Plutarch, *An seni*, 19, 794A: ‘Under some conditions even contentiousness and rashness have a certain timeliness and grace becoming to youths’ (transl. H.N.Fowler). Cf. *jR* 80 n. 74.
- 76 Cf. pp. 152ff. (concerning youthful style in eloquence).
- 77 For similar expressions, cf. *jR* 78 n. 70.
- 78 Cicero, *Cael.*, 31, 76–7 (transl. R.Gardner).
- 79 Cf. *jR* 80–110.
- 80 Cf. *jR* 80–94.
- 81 Cf. *jR* 80–4. In the Greek world of the *comoedia palliata*, this ‘dangerous’ period of life begins at the end of the epheby, at the age of 19. Cf. Terence, *Andr.*, 51–4 (a father talking about his son): ‘As soon as my son was grown up and could take his own line in life— (of course till then one had no means of knowing the truth or telling his bent, while he was under the constraint of childhood, fear and a master)... As for the usual doings of young men, such as interesting themselves in keeping horses or hounds, or in philosophical lectures, he didn’t pick out one of these above the rest, but still he followed them all with moderation. I was delighted’ (transl. J.Sargeaunt). Cf. Plautus, *Merc.*, 40–2; *Most.*, 85ff.; 149–51, and *jR* 80–2.
- 82 Therefore (and also because of its connection with the god Liber, cf. p. 6), the *toga virilis* is also called the *toga libera*. Cf. Ovid, *F.*, 3, 777–8; Propertius, 4, 1, 132.
- 83 *Cumque iter ambiguum est et vitae nescius error/deducit trepidas ramosa in compita mentes* (lines 34–5). The allusion to the letter Y as a symbol of human life (cf. pp. 13–14) is clear.
- 84 Persius, 5, 30ff.
- 85 Statius, *Silv.*, 5, 2, 68–9 (transl. J.H. Mozley). Cf. Horace, *S.*, 1, 2, 16–17; Apuleius, *Apol.*, 98, 5–6 and *jR* 82–3 n. 82.
- 86 Plutarch, *Aud.*, 1, 37CE (transl. F.C.Babbitt).
- 87 Herodian, 1, 3–4 (transl. C.R.Whittaker). Cf. *jR* 84 n. 83. The historicity of this episode is uncertain, but this is not relevant for our study: a father is described in a way one expects him to behave.
- 88 Cf. *jR* 84–90.
- 89 Cf. J.-P.Néraudau (1979) 364–5: In the second century BC a class of adolescents arose’ (my transl.); L.Giuliano (1979) 34, 73–7: ‘The social maturity, which in the fifth and fourth centuries BC was still automatically attained at puberty and socially coincided with its official recognition by the assumption of the *toga virilis*, from the second century on was fully acquired at the age of 25; whereby the

young puber was only recognized as mature for the purposes of defending his fatherland, but not for administering with fullness of judgement his own patrimony and the state' (my transl.).

- 90 Cf. pp. 83, 229–30.
- 91 Polybius, 31, 25, 2ff. (transl. W.R.Paton). Cf. *JR* 85 n. 86. For an (idealized) description of 'serious' youth in earlier times. cf. Sallust, *Cat.*, 7, 4–5; Pliny, *Ep.*, 8, 14, 4ff.; *Pan.*, 81, 2.
- 92 E.g. Sallust, *Iug.*, 63, 3 (cf. n. 119); Seneca, *Ep.*, 50, 3. For the difference between city and rural youth, cf. Terence, *Adelphoe, passim*; Ps.-Quintilian, *Decl. min.*, 298 pp. 176–7. Cf. *JR* 89 n. 113 (youth of the country or in the provinces). According to the Ancients, youths in (big) cities were threatened by the spectacles in the theatre, erotic poetry and pictures, youthful beauty itself, philosophical systems such as Epicureanism and the Academy, money, a corrupt public life. References in *JR* 85–6 nn. 88–99; 89 n. 110.
- 93 In this book, however, we shall often meet the young Augustine. He came from a modest family from the small African village of Tagaste. His example makes clear that in such circumstances too it was not always impossible to be 'really' young.
- 94 Nicolaus of Damascus, *V. Caes.*, 15 (transl. C.M. Hall). Cf., e.g. Curtius, 10, 5, 26: *vitia vel fortunae vel aetatis*; Ps.-Quintilian, *Decl. mai.*, 9, 10: *vel ex aetate mores vel ex fortuna*. Cf. *JR* 90 n. 114. Besides the *vitia fortunae*, the *vitia temporum* (Cicero, *Cael.*, 12, 30), the *vitia otii* (Seneca, *Ep.*, 56, 9) and the *vitia aetatis* (= *adulescentiae*) (cf. p. 16) endangered youth.
- 95 Cf. pp. 49ff.
- 96 Cf. *JR* 86 with n. 96. Cp. J.André (1966) *passim*, e.g. pp. 105ff, ('L'otium, l'amour et le malaise de la jeunesse', on youth in comedy), 221ff. (on Catullus), 403ff. (on the elegiac poets). On Catullus, cf. n. 97; on the elegiac poets, cf. L.Alfonsi (1954) 375–6; (1956a) 187–209.
- 97 Catullus, 51, 13–16 (transl. F.W.Cornish). Cf. A.J.Woodman (1966) 217–26; R.C.Jensen (1967) 363–5; R.I.Frank (1968) 233–9; I.Borzsák (1970) 97–108; C.P.Segal (1970) 25–31.
- 98 Afranius, in Gellius, 15, 13, 3 (transl. J.C.Rolfe). Cf. *JR* 88 n. 106.
- 99 Seneca, *Contr.*, 2, 3, 3 (transl. M. Winterbottom). Cf. *JR* 88 n. 107; E.Eyben (1991) 129ff.
- 100 Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 17, 13AC. Cf. *JR* 87–8 with n. 102.
- 101 E.g. Jerome, *Ep.*, 123, 14. Cf. *JR* 87 with n. 101.
- 102 Syrus, 703 (transl. J.W.Duff): *ubi peccat aetas maior, male discit minor*.
- 103 Cicero, *Off.*, 1, 34, 123 (transl. W.Miller) Cf. Plutarch, *Coniug. praec.*, 47, 144F, and *JR* 89 n. 109.
- 104 Plato, *Rep.*, 8, 562E–563B. Cf. A.Bork (1961) 53.

- 105 Cicero, *Rep.*, 1, 43, 67 (transl. C.W.Keyes). Cf. Dio, 45, 34, 3; Libanius, *Or.*, 62, 24, and E.Eyben (1991) 125ff. (on spoilt children).
- 106 Cf. *JR* 90–4.
- 107 Cf. Cicero, *Cael.*, 18, 42 (cf. p. 17).
- 108 Cf. *JR* 90–2.
- 109 Cf. M.K. Hopkins (1965) 309–27; E.Eyben (1985) 435ff. According to B.D. Shaw (1987) 30–46 and R.P.Saller (1987) 21–34, girls and men of the lower classes married in their late teens and twenties respectively. In the senatorial order, however, marriage before the age of 25 was not uncommon because of the Augustan marriage legislation with its career incentives for senators with wives and children. Cf. R.Syme (1987) 318–32. On the age of women at marriage, cf. also J.F.Gardner (1986) 38–41.
- 110 Terence, *Ad.*, 150–3 (transl. J. Sargeant).
- 111 Terence, *Andr.*, 151ff.; 443ff.; 560ff.; 828ff. (transl. J.Sargeant).
- 112 Cicero, *Fam.*, 8, 13, 1. On this marriage, cf. J.H.Collins (1951–2) 164–8.
- 113 Statius, *Silv.*, 3, 5, 24–8. Cf. *ibid.*, 1, 2, 26–9; 1, 2, 128.
- 114 Augustine, *Conf.*, 2, 2, 3. Cf. *ibid.*, 2, 2, 4; 2, 3, 8; and below, pp. 239–40.
- 115 Terence, *Andr.*, 189–90.
- 116 Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 19, 13F (transl. F. C Babbitt). Cf. *JR* 92 n. 119.
- 117 John Chrysostom, *In. gloria*, 76; 81–2 (transl. M.L.W.Laistner). Cf. *JR* 92 n. 120, and E.Eyben (1985) 438–9.
- 118 Cf. *JR* 92–4.
- 119 Cf. Sallust, *Iug.*, 63, 3: ‘Having been born and reared at Arpinum, where he had spent all his boyhood, he had no sooner reached the age for military life than he had given himself the training of active service, not of Grecian eloquence or the elegance of the city. Thus engrossed in wholesome pursuits his unspoiled nature soon matured (*brevi adolevit*)’ (transl. J.C.Rolfe).
- 120 Cf. pp. 49–51, and E.Eyben (1981a) 345ff.
- 121 Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.*, 11, 22, 4.
- 122 Cicero, *Phil.*, 5, 17, 47.
- 123 *Panegyrici latini*, 12, 7, 2–4. Cf. *JR* 78 with n. 73, 93 n. 122.
- 124 Plutarch, *An seni*, 2, 784C (transl. H.N.Fowler).
- 125 Cf. P.Roussel (1951) 123–227.
- 126 Cf. pp. 37ff. Cf. Plutarch, *An seni*, 2, 784D; 7, 787C; 12, 790D; 13, 791BC; 25, 796A.
- 127 E.g. Cicero, *Cael.*, 12, 28; 18, 43. Cf. *JR* 78 n. 73.
- 128 *Panegyrici latini*, 12, 7, 2–4 (cf. p. 27). Cf. *JR* 104–5.
- 129 Cicero, *Cael.*, 18, 42 (cf. p. 17).

- 130 Cf. Plutarch, *An seni*, 18, 793E: 'Such [over-ambitious] old men are hated by the young, who feel that they do not allow them opportunities for public activity and do not permit them to come before the public, and by people in general their love of precedence and of office is held in no less disrepute than is other old men's love of wealth and pleasure' (transl. H.N.Fowler).
- 131 Dio, 21, 70, 3 (transl. H.B.Foster). Cf. Cicero, *Phil.*, 5, 17, 47 (concerning the *virtus* of young Octavianus); cf. p. 66.
- 132 Cf. *JR* 94–110.
- 133 E.g. *Digest*, 27, 10, 4 (*aetas infirma*; cf. *JR* 95 n. 129); 4, 4, 7, 5 (*aetas imbecilla*; cf. *JR* 95 n. 130); Livy, 26, 19, 9 (*aetas haudquaquam matura*; cf. *JR* 96 n. 130). Cf. Cicero, *Ac.*, 2, 3, 8: *infirmisimum tempus aetatis*. For the weakness of youthful thinking as cause of youthful shortcomings, cf. *JR* 95–7. Of course, character also influenced youthful behaviour: cf. *JR* 95.
- 134 E.g. Ps.-Quintilian, *Decl. min.*, 322 p. 266: *adulescens est: omnes cupiditates, omnes impetus in hac aetate facilius convalescunt*. For less frequently used (but vivid) expressions, cf. Jerome *Ep.*, 125, 1 (cf. p. 29): *pubertatis incentiva*; Ambrose, *Cain*, 1, 3, 11 PL 14, 321 (cf. p. 29): *motus adulescentiae*; Augustine, *Conf.*, 2, 2, 2 (cf. p. 29): *scatebra pubertatis*; *ibid.*, 2, 2, 3: *fluctus aetatis*. Cf. *JR* 98–102, esp. 99 n. 141 (*voluptates adulescentiae*); 99–100 nn. 142–5 (*libidines adulescentiae*); 102 n. 151–2 (*impetus, motus adulescentiae (sim.)*).
- 135 E.g. *Codex Iustinianus*, 5, 59, 4; 6, 61, 8, 5: *iuvēniles calores*; Phaedrus, 115, 4: *fervida adulescentia*; Seneca, *Phaedr.*, 290: *iuvēnum feroces flammās*; Achilles Tatius, 4, 10, 1 (cf. n. 145): *ἡλικία ζέουσα*; Clemens of Alexandria, *Quis dives*, 8, 3, GCS 3, 165: *ἐν σκιρτήματι νεοτησίῳ καὶ τῷ καύσωνι τῆς ἡλικίας*; Basil, *Reg. fus.*, 16, 1, 1 PG 31, 957: *τὸ βράζον τῆς νεότητος καὶ πρὸς τὰς ὁρμὰς δυσκάθεκτον*. Cf. *JR* 102–4, esp. n. 153.
- 136 E.g. Syrus, 566 (cf. p. 17); Panegyrici *latini*, 12, 7, 4 (cf. p. 27). Cf. *JR* 104–5.
- 137 Ambrose, *Cain*, 1, 3, 11 PL 14, 321 (transl. J.Savage). Cf. *JR* 100 n. 145.
- 138 John Chrysostom, *Ep.*, 3, 12 PG 52, 585. Cf. *JR* 100 n. 144.
- 139 Cf. *JR* 106–7 (the changes of puberty); 107–10 (the warmth of the blood).
- 140 Augustine, *Conf.* 2, 2, 2.
- 141 Jerome, *Ep.*, 125, 1. Cf. *JR* 107 with n. 163.
- 142 Jerome, *Ep.*, 52, 3 and 11 (transl. F.A. Wright).
- 143 Ambrose, *Is.*, 7, 60 PL 14, 525. Cf. *JR* 107 n. 164.
- 144 E.g. Petronius, 59, 1: *parce adulescentulo: sanguen illi fervet*; Prudentius, *Symm.*, 2, 320: *sanguine praecalido fervet nervosa*

- iuventa*. Cf. *jR* 107–10. Because youth is a ‘boiling age’ (cf. pp. 28–30), wine in particular—a ‘hot’ drink—has to be avoided by youngsters (not by older people). Cf. *jR* 109–10.
- 145 In Achilles Tatius, 4, 10, we read how an (in this case mental) illness, too, could be seen as the result of the warmth of the blood: ‘Such troubles were not lasting, but often occurred at the hot season of youth, when the blood, being young and new, and boiling at its approach to full age, overflowed the veins and floods the brain, drowning the fount of reason’ (my transl.).
- 146 Plutarch, *Virt. mor.*, 11, 450EF (transl. W.C.Helmbold); *Lib. et aegr.*, 9 (transl. F.H.Sandbach).
- 147 Cf. *jR* 110–28.
- 148 Cf. *jR* 110–16.
- 149 Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 2, 12–14, 1389 a 3ff. (transl. J.H.Freese). Cf. F.Boll (1950) 163ff., esp. 168–70; A. Dyroff (1939) *passim*; H.J.Mette (1982) 263ff.; J.Verhaeghe (1980) 115–19. Plato is much more negative about youth, and sees old age as the climax of the human life-span. Cf. A. Stein (1966) *passim*.
- 150 Ptolemy, *Tetr.*, 4, 10, 203–7 (transl. F.E.Robbins). Cf. F.Boll (1950) 193ff.
- 151 Cf. F.Boll (1950) 183ff. (the influence of the number 7 on the human life-span).
- 152 Horace, *A.P.*, 156–78 (transl. H.R.Fairclough). Cf. F.Boll (1950) 171ff; C.G.Harcum (1914) 114–18; G.R.Coffman (1934) 249–77; P. Colmant (1956) 58–63; P.Grimal (1968) 170ff; C.O.Brink (1971) 231ff.
- 153 Cf. *jR* 116–28.
- 154 Cf. pp. 28–30.
- 155 Cicero, *C.M.*, 10, 33 (cf. p. 9). Cf *jR* 103–4 with n. 155.
- 156 Horace, *A.P.*, 163 (cf. pp. 36–7). Cf. *jR* 117–18.
- 157 Ambrose, *Noe*, 22, 81 PL 14, 399. Cf. *jR* 117–18 with nn. 193–6.
- 158 Horace *A.P.*, 165 (cf. pp. 36–7). Cf. *jR* 118 with nn. 197–8 (the *mobilis, vaga adulescentia*).
- 159 Ps.-Seneca, *Oct.*, 189–91 (transl. F.J.Miller).
- 160 Pliny, *Ep.*, 3, 1, 2 (transl. B.Radice).
- 161 Augustine, *Conf.*, 2, 3, 6.
- 162 Commodian, *Apol.*, 3–6.
- 163 Horace, *A.P.*, 167 (cf. p. 37). Cf. Ptolemy, *Tetr.*, 4, 10, 205 (cf. p. 35); Servius, *Aen*, 6, 114 (cf. p. 231). For an old man, on the contrary, too much ambition is misplaced: cf. Plutarch, *An seni*, 25, 796A.
- 164 But see Cicero, *Cael*, 31, 76 (cf. pp. 18–19).
- 165 Plutarch, *An seni*, 13, 791B. Cf. *jR* 120–1 with nn. 212–13.
- 166 Seneca, *Ep.*, 74, 21.

- 167 *Historia Augusta, Tyr.*, 13, 2. Cf. *jR* 121 with n. 216.
- 168 Cicero, *Off.*, 1, 34, 122. Cf. *jR* 104 n. 155.
- 169 Livy, 3, 12, 7. Cf. *jR* 121–2 with n. 218.
- 170 Cicero, *C.M.*, 6, 20. Cf. *jR* 121–2 with n. 219.
- 171 Horace, *A.P.*, 163 (cf. pp. 36–7). Cf. *jR* 121 n. 214.
- 172 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 3, 31, 7. Cf. *jR* 121 with n. 215.
- 173 Cf. *jR* 122 with nn. 220ff.
- 174 Augustine, *Civ.*, 17, 20. Cf. *jR* 123 n. 228.
- 175 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 16, 30, 3: *imprudencia aetatis*; *Digest*, 4, 4, 24, 2: *iuvēnilis levitas*; Augustine, *Duab. an.*, 9, 11 PL 42, 102; Cicero, *Tusc.*, 5, 21, 62: *improvida aetas*. Cf. *jR* 123 with nn. 229–32.
- 176 Horace, *A.P.*, 164 (cf. pp. 36–7).
- 177 Terence, *Heaut.*, 971. Cf. *jR* 123 n. 234.
- 178 Horace, *A.P.*, 163 (cf. pp. 36–7). Cf. *jR* 117.
- 179 Cicero, *ad Br.*, 1, 18, 4. Cf. Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 5, 3E (εὐπλαστον γὰρ καὶ ὕγρον ἢ νεότης), and *jR* 124 n. 235.
- 180 Seneca, *Clem.*, 2, 5, 2. Cf. *jR* 124 n. 236.
- 181 Cicero, *C.M.*, 10, 33 (cf. p. 9). Cf. *jR* 124 n. 238.
- 182 Jerome, *Ep.*, 121, 8. Cf. Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 18, 13F (σκιρτῶσα νεότης), and *jR* 124 n. 239 (on children), n. 240 (on youths).
- 183 Cf. n. 62.
- 184 Cf. the chapters dealing with these subjects.
- 185 Horace, *A.P.*, 173–4 (cf. pp. 36–7).
- 186 But see Seneca, *Ep.*, 97, 9: ‘For the young men of to-day live far more simple lives than those of the Republican epoch’ (transl. R.M. Gummere).
- 187 Maximianus, 1, 105ff. (the *iuvēnilis decus* contrasted with *pueritia* and *senectus*); Cicero, *Top.*, 7, 32 (*flos aetatis*). Cf. *jR* 125 n. 245.
- 188 Cf. Livy, 40, 7, 2: *hilaritas iuvēnilis*; Ambrose, *Off.*, 1, 44, 217 PL 16,88: *alacris adulescentia*; Seneca, *Phaedr.*, 453: *laetitia iuvenem, fons decet tristis senem*. Cf. *jR* 125 nn. 246–7.
- 189 Horace, *A.P.*, 165 (cf. pp. 36–7).
- 190 Augustine, *Ac.*, 1, 1, 1 PL 32,906.
- 191 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 3, 8, 4 (transl. C.H.Moore). Cf. *jR* 126 n. 250.
- 192 Seneca, *Ep.*, 108, 12.23.26–7 (transl. R.M.Gummere). Cf. *jR* 126 n. 251.
- 193 Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.*, 1, 2, 3. Cf. Juvenal, 10, 300–3: ‘though nature...have lavishly gifted him with a pure mind and a cheek mantling with modest blood (*vultumque modesto sanguine ferventem*) —and what better thing can Nature, more careful, more potent than any guardian, bestow upon a youth?’ (transl. G.G. Ramsay). On youthful *pudor*, cf. *jR* 126–8 with nn. 252–61.
- 194 Cf. Nicolaus of Damascus, *V. Caes.*, 13 (ed. C.M.Hall), and *jR* 127 n. 257.

195 Seneca, *Ep.*, 11, 1ff. (transl. R.M.Gummere).

196 Macrobius, *Sat.*, 7, 11, 1–3.

II YOUTH AND THE ESTABLISHED ORDER

- 1 Cf. *jR* 240–54.
- 2 Cf. *jR* 240–2.
- 3 Cf. G.Dumézil (1938) 289–301; J.Gagé (1958) 34–64; J.-P.Morel (1964) 375–88; (1969) 208–52; (1976) 663–83; J.-P.Néraudau (1979) 327–44; P.Ginestet (1991) 51ff.
- 4 J.-P.Morel (1969) 220–1 (my transl.).
- 5 Ovid, *F.*, 6, 83–4; Macrobius, *Sat.*, 1, 12, 16.
- 6 Gellius, 10, 28. Cf. *jR* 20.
- 7 Livy, 5, 39, 12.
- 8 Cf. pp. 52ff.
- 9 Cf. O.Hey (1892) 180 with n. 1; J.-P.Morel (1964) 383 n. 2.
- 10 E.g. Ovid, *F.*, 6, 88. In fact *Iunius* is deduced from Iuno. Cf. *jR* p. 241 n. 103.
- 11 G.Dumézil (1938) 291 (my transl.).
- 12 Livy, 1, 9, 6ff.
- 13 Plutarch, *Rom.*, 21, 3–5; *Caes.*, 61, 2; *Ant.*, 12, 1. Cf. e.g. A.W.J. Holleman (1974) *passim*; J.-P.Néraudau (1979) 200–15.
- 14 The so-called *fescennini* are mentioned by e.g. Catullus, 61, 126–7; Horace, *Ep.*, 2, 1, 145–6. The original meaning of these ribald verses was apotropaic.
- 15 Livy, 7, 1. Cf. *jR* 154–65; J.-P.Morel (1969) 208–52.
- 16 Thus T.Frank (1971) 14–15, 21.
- 17 Cf. *jR* 242–6.
- 18 Cicero, *Off.*, 2, 13, 45 (transl. W.Miller).
- 19 Polybius, 6, 54, 3.
- 20 Cf. p. 38.
- 21 Servius, *Aen.*, 4, 157.
- 22 Virgil, *Aen.*, 11, 154–5.
- 23 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 6, 65, 2. Cf. *jR* 242 n. 115.
- 24 Cf. *jR* 243–4.
- 25 Livy, 7, 6; Valerius Maximus, 5, 6, 2.
- 26 Livy, 2, 12, 2ff. Cf. J.Gagé (1958) 49ff.
- 27 Livy, 21, 46, 7.
- 28 Plutarch, *Aem.*, 22, 1–4.
- 29 Plutarch, *Aem.*, 21, 1–2.
- 30 Plutarch, *Brut.*, 24, 2.
- 31 Cicero, *Off.*, 2, 13, 45; Plutarch, *Brut.*, 24, 2.
- 32 Plutarch, *Brut.*, 49, 5.
- 33 Cf. *jR* 121–2, 244–5.

- 34 Livy, 8, 7, 1ff.; 8, 12, 1. Cf. Valerius Maximus, 9, 3, 4, and J.-P.Néraudau (1979) 249–52 (on the conflict between *furor* and *disciplina*); J.-P.Néraudau (1976) 685–94.
- 35 Plutarch, *Aem.*, 27, 4 (transl. B.Perrin).
- 36 Livy, 23, 40, 4.
- 37 Caesar, *Civ.*, 2, 38, 2,
- 38 E.g. Livy, 22, 53. Cf. *JR* 245–6. In late antiquity many men went so far as to cut off their thumbs to escape military service: cf. A.H.M. Jones (1964) II, 617–18.
- 39 Cicero, *Tusc.*, 2, 16, 38 (transl. J.E.King).
- 40 Appian, *Civ.*, 2, 11, 74 (transl. H.White). Cf. *JR* 244 with n. 126.
- 41 Ovid, *F.*, 6, 85–6 (transl. J.G.Frazer). Cf. *JR* 247 n. 151, 253 n. 151.
- 42 Seneca, *Contr.*, 7, 7, 13–14 (transl. M.Winterbottom). Cf. *JR* 248 n. 142, and Ps.-Quintilian, *Decl. min.*, 317 p. 247.
- 43 Plutarch, *Luc.*, 34; Cicero, *Har.*, 20, 42.
- 44 Cicero, *Brut.*, 81, 282 (transl. G.L.Hendrickson).
- 45 Livy, 8, 30, 4ff. (transl. B.O. Foster).
- 46 Zonaras, 8,26. Cf. Livy, 28, 40, 7, where Fabius Maximus speaks about his ‘inborn habit of delay, which young men are free to call fear and lack of spirit (*insitae cunctationis, quam metum pigritiamque homines adulescentes sane appellent*)’ (transl. F.G. Moore).
- 47 Livy, 6, 23, 3–6 (transl. B.O.Foster).
- 48 Cf. *JR* 249–50; M. Bonnefond (1982) 200ff.: T.E. J.Wiedemann (1989) 55. One can compare Scipio’s struggle with Fabius Maximus with the conflict between young Alcibiades and Nicias as described in Thucydides, 6, 9–18. Cf. F.Wasserman (1976) 119ff; M. Bonnefond (1982) 202ff.
- 49 Livy, 26, 18, 11; 26, 19, 9; Appian, *Iber.*, 6,4,18.
- 50 Plutarch, *Fab. Max.*, 25–6 (transl. B.Perrin).
- 51 Plutarch, *Fab. Max.*, 25–6; Livy, 28, 40, 9ff.; 28, 43, 1ff. (transl. F.G. Moore). Other references are in *JR* 250 n. 145.
- 52 Cf. J. Suolahti (1955) *passim*.
- 53 Cicero, *Font.*, 19, 42 (transl. N.H. Watts).
- 54 Horace, *C.*, 3.2.
- 55 Cf. G.J.Szemler (1972) 191 ff., esp. 192: ‘A substantial majority of priesthoods was reached [relatively] early in life, before the individuals could gain distinction for themselves. This would indicate that in these cases, cooptation or inauguration was not a sign of recognition but rather the means utilized by the *nobiles* as a training ground for potential advancement, since life-long appointment naturally established lasting personal contacts.’ Cf. L. Giuliano (1979) 142–3 n. 15.
- 56 As *contubernalis*. Cf. J.Harmand (1967) 383ff.

- 57 J. Suolahti (1955) *passim*, esp. pp. 297, 210, 240–1. Cf. e.g. J. Harmand (1967) 349ff., 392 with nn. 537–8; T.P. Wiseman (1971) 143ff., for whom junior offices in the army were attractive only for *homines novi* ‘who had to create their own qualifications’, not for young aristocrats who were assured of a career.
- 58 Tacitus, *Agr.*, 5, 2 (transl. M. Hutton).
- 59 Pliny, *Ep.*, 8, 14, 4–7 (transl. B. Radice).
- 60 Vegetius, 1, 5. On the imperial administration, cf. A.H.M. Jones (1964) II, 563ff.
- 61 Cf. F. Lammert (1937) 1448–50; J. Harmand (1967) *passim*; R.W. Davies (1969) 208–32.
- 62 Of course, there were exceptions: cf. e.g. Statius, *Silv.*, 5, 2.
- 63 Cf. E. Birley (1953) 133ff.; H. Devijver (1974) 83–146; E. Eyben (1981a) 345–9; and, for late antiquity, cf. A.H.M. Jones (1964) I, 386 (with some exceptions).
- 64 *B.G.U.* 423 (transl. A.S. Hunt/C.C. Edgar).
- 65 Cf. *JR* 216–39.
- 66 Sallust, *Cat.*, 3, 3–5 (transl. J.C. Rolfe). Cf. Ps.-Sallust, *Caes.*, 2, 1, 3.
- 67 For political activities of youth during the Empire (especially complicity in conspiracies against the emperor), cf. *JR* 237–9.
- 68 Cf. *JR* 217–21; A.W. Lintott (1970) 24–9 (who is of the opinion that a basic tradition about the *adulescentes nobiles* existed already in the earliest Roman annalists); E. Eyben (1972c) 44ff.; J.-P. Néraudau (1979) 249ff.
- 69 Livy, 2, 3, 2–3.
- 70 Livy, 2, 3–5; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 5, 6, 4ff.; Plutarch, *Publ.*, 3–6.
- 71 Livy, 2, 28, 9.
- 72 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 6, 39, 1.
- 73 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 6, 65, 2–3.
- 74 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 6, 66, 1–2. According to both Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy, no minimum age was required for entering the senate during this period. Perhaps they are right. In the last words we have to do with a clear anticipation of the *Lex Villia annalis* (180 BC) discussed on pp. 8–9.
- 75 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 11, 2, 1ff.; 10, 2, 1 (transl. E. Spelman). Cf. Livy, 3, 37, 6–8: ‘the young nobles not only made no stand against wrong-doing, but frankly showed that they preferred licence for themselves to liberty for all’ (transl. B.O. Foster).
- 76 On what follows, cf. Livy, 3, 11, 3ff. (transl. B.O. Foster); Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 10, 5, 1ff. Cf. J.-P. Néraudau (1980) 251–60.
- 77 Cf. p. 107.

- 78 Livy, 3, 14, 2ff. (transl. B.O.Foster). Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 10, 41, 3–4.
- 79 Livy, 4, 14, 6; 6, 42, 13.
- 80 Cf. *JR* 221–33, and G.Boissier (1910) 167–219; O. Seel (1967) 261–326; J. Granarolo (1960) 483–519; E.Eyben (1972c) 55ff.; J.-P. Néraudau (1979) 358–68; L.Giuliano (1979) 113–43; M. Bonnefond (1982) 217ff.
- 81 R.M. Ogilvie (1978) 378.
- 82 O. Seel (1967) 308.
- 83 Cf. pp. 197ff.
- 84 Cf. Plutarch, *Crass.*, 6, 2; *Sull.*, 8, 2; *Praec. ger. reip.*, 12, 806E.
- 85 Cf. D.Montero (1988) 53–102.
- 86 Sallust, *Cat.*, 14, 1; 14, 5–6; 17, 6 (transl. J.C.Rolfe). Cf. M.Reinhold (1976) 52–3.
- 87 Sallust, *Cat.*, 37, 7 (transl. J.C.Rolfe).
- 88 Sallust, *Cat.*, 20,1 (transl. J.C.Rolfe). Cf. J.Plescia (1976) 152 n. 57; J.-P.Néraudau (1979) 367.
- 89 Cf. Cicero, *Cael.*, 6, 13: '[Catiline was] grave with the old, amiable with the young (*cum iuventute comiter*)'; *Cat.*, 2, 4, 8: 'Who ever proved so active a seducer of the young (*iuventutis inlecebra*) as Catiline?'
- 90 Sallust, *Cat.*, 16, 1–3 (transl. J.C. Rolfe).
- 91 Cicero, *Mur.*, 24, 49; *Cat.*, 1, 6, 13; 2, 4, 8; 2, 10, 22 and 23; Plutarch, *Cic.*, 10, 3.
- 92 Cicero, *Cael.*, 4, 10; 5, 12 (transl. R. Gardner).
- 93 On Cicero's relationship with youth, cf. T.Frank (1919) 396–415 (on the connection between the *poetae novi* (cf. below, p. 181), the Atticists (cf. below, pp. 154ff.) and the circle of *iuvenes* who supported him in his conflict with Clodius); W.Allen (1937–8) 357–9; O. Seel (1967) 263–326; A.W.Lintott (1972) 59–60 (on the *adulescentes* of those days as modern counterparts of the youthful defenders of the senate in early Rome).
- 94 Cicero, *Har. resp.*, 3, 4. On the following episode, which caused a great scandal in Rome, cf. K.Büchner (1939) 896ff.; P.Grimal (1963) 213ff.
- 95 Cicero, *Att.*, 1, 18, 2 (transl. E.O.Winstedt). Cf. *ibid.*, 1, 16, 1: 'Didn't I rate the old men for their frivolity, the young for their wanton passions (*levitatem senum, libidinem iuventutis*)?'
- 96 Cicero, *Att.*, 1, 14, 5; 1, 16, 11.
- 97 Cicero, *Att.*, 1, 14, 5. Note the similarity to the conduct of the patrician youth during the Early Republic as described in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 10, 39, 3; 10, 41, 3–4, and Livy 2, 56, 11.
- 98 Cicero, *Att.*, 1, 16, 11.

- 99 Cicero, *Att.*, 1, 19, 8.
- 100 Cicero, *Att.*, 2, 12, 2; 2, 8, 1; 2, 7, 3 (transl. E.O.Winstedt).
- 101 Cicero, *Phil.*, 2, 18, 44–6; Plutarch, *Ant.*, 2, 3. Cf. pp. 244–5.
- 102 Plutarch, *Ant.*, 2, 4.
- 103 Cf. A.W.Lintott (1972) 77ff., 193ff.
- 104 Cf. p. 224.
- 105 Q.Cicero, *Comm. pet.*, 8, 33. Cf. *ibid.*, 1, 3; 1, 6. Cf. Cicero, *Fam.*, 2, 6, 3 (about the *iuventus* who supported Milo's candidature for the consulship). The Younger Cato, on the contrary, opposes the use of the *delicata iuventus* during the election campaigns, but Cicero (*Mur.*, 35, 74) is of the opinion that this young man is too serious.
- 106 Plutarch, *Cic.*, 14, 5.
- 107 Cicero, *Phil.*, 2, 7, 16.
- 108 Plutarch, *Caes.*, 8, 2.
- 109 Plutarch, *Cic.*, 31, 1. Cf. *ibid.*, 13, 4; Cicero, *Red. sen.*, 5, 12; *Sest.*, 12, 27. One of them was Publius Crassus, the son of the *triumvir* who urged youth to march through the streets in mourning garments and succeeded in reconciling his father with Cicero. Cf. Plutarch, *Crass.*, 13, 4; *Cic.*, 33, 5.
- 110 Plutarch, *Cic.*, 40, 1.
- 111 Dio Cassius, 46, 8, 4 (transl. E.Cary).
- 112 Cicero, *Att.*, 2, 18, 1. Cf. *ibid.*, 2, 19, 3.
- 113 Cicero, *Att.*, 2, 24, 2ff.
- 114 Suetonius, *Caes.*, 27, 3 (cf. p. 107).
- 115 Cicero, *Att.*, 7, 7, 6; 7, 3, 5.
- 116 Cicero, *Fam.*, 8, 14, 3 (transl. W.Glynn Williams).
- 117 Plutarch, *Cato Min.*, 14, 3.
- 118 Cicero, *Att.*, 1, 16, 11 (transl. E.O.Winstedt).
- 119 Cicero, *Att.*, 2, 8, 1.
- 120 Cicero, *Q. fr.*, 1, 2, 15 (transl. W.Glynn Williams).
- 121 Plutarch, *Pomp.*, 24, 2.
- 122 Cicero, *Q. Fr.*, 2, 3, 4.
- 123 Cicero, *Off.*, 2, 13, 45. Cf. Appian, *Civ.*, 5, 3, 25, who tells us how young men 'eager for military service for the sake of gain' preferred to join the army of Pompey's son Sextus 'as representing the better cause'.
- 124 Cicero, *Phil.*, 2, 11, 26.
- 125 Plutarch, *Brut.*, 24, 2. Cf. *JR* 230 n. 50.
- 126 O.Seel (1967) 277 (my transl.).
- 127 Sallust, *Cat.*, 18, 4 (transl. J.C.Rolfe).
- 128 Ps-Sallust, *ad Caes.*, 1, 5, 5–6 (transl. J.C.Rolfe). Cf. Sallust, *Cat.*, 12, 2; 13, 4–5; Cicero, *Cat.*, 2, 5, 10.
- 129 Sallust, *Cat.*, 17, 6 (transl. J.C.Rolfe).
- 130 Sallust, *Cat.*, 21, 1.

- 131 R.G.Austin (1969) XV. On Caelius, cf. G.Boissier (1910) 167–219; O.Seel (1967) 293ff.; M.Volponi (1970) 197–280; T.P.Wiseman (1985) 54–91.
- 132 Cf. Sallust, *Cat.*, 17, 6; 37, 7. Cf. p. 57.
- 133 P. McGushin (1977) 99–100. Cf. E.Eyben (1982) 265–77, esp. 275–6.
- 134 Cf. *JR* 251–4. For the generation gap in the late Republican senate, in Greek and Roman antiquity and in imperial Rome, cf. respectively M.Bonnefond (1982) 175–225, M.Reinhold (1976) 15– 54, and B.Baldwin (1976) 221–33.
- 135 Cf. pp. 48–9.
- 136 H.H.Scullard (1973) 173–4, who quotes Cicero, *Phil.*, 5, 17, 48. For other youthful consuls, cf. *JR* 252 n. 149. For the *Lex Villia annalis*, cf. pp. 8–9.
- 137 E.g. P.Greenhalgh (1980), especially 12ff. (Beardless Emperor); A. Keaveney (1982) 111–39.
- 138 Valerius Maximus, 6,2,8.
- 139 Plutarch, *Pomp.*, 6; 8, 2; 13, 4; 14. Other references are in *JR* 251 n. 146.
- 140 Cf. e.g. J.H.McCarthy (1931) 362–73; R.Syme (1966) 112ff.; A. Alföldi (1976).
- 141 E.g. Cicero, *Phil.*, 5, 17, 47; 14, 10, 28 (Octavian's virtue surpasses his age). But see *idem*, *Att.*, 16, 8, 1 ('But look at his age'). Cf. Appian, *Civ.*, 3, 11, 82, where Cicero asks that Octavian should be given the consulate in spite of his age and proposes 'that some man of prudence from among the older ones should be chosen as his colleague to be a firm guardian of the immature nature of Octavian' (transl. H.White). Other references are in *JR* 251 n. 147.
- 142 References in *JR* 251 n. 148. Cf. J.H.McCarthy (1932) 362ff.
- 143 Appian, *Civ.*, 3, 4, 29.
- 144 Appian, *Civ.*, 3, 11, 80.
- 145 Dio, 46, 41, 4.
- 146 Dio, 46, 46, 2. Further references are in *JR* 251–2.
- 147 R.Syme (1966) 113.
- 148 Cf. Nicolaus of Damascus, *V. Caes.*, 4: '[after acceptance of the *toga virilis* at the age of 14] his mother [Attia] would not let him leave the house other than as he did before, when he was a child, and she made him keep to the same mode of life and sleep in the same apartment as before. For he was of age only by law and in other respects was taken care of as a child' (transl. C.M.Hall).
- 149 A.Alföldi (1976) 31 (my transl.).
- 150 Cf. *JR* 252–4; W.Hartke (1972); T.E.J.Wiedemann (1989) 124ff. M. Kleijwegt (1991) does not deal with this phenomenon.
- 151 W.Hartke (1972) 219 (my transl.). Old emperors too were distrusted. Cf. *JR* 252 n. 150.

- 152 Cf. pp. 37ff., and Plutarch, *An seni*, *passim*.
- 153 E.g. Tacitus, *Ann.*, 4, 17, 3. Cf. *JR* 253 n. 152.
- 154 Cf. *JR* 253 nn. 153–4.
- 155 Herodian, 1, 1, 6 (transl. C.R. Whittaker).
- 156 *Augustan History*, *Tac.*, 6, 2–7 (transl. D. Magie).
- 157 Cf. H.W. Pleket (1979) 173–92; E. Eyben (1981a) 328–50; T.E. J. Wiedemann (1989) 131ff.; M. Kleijwegt (1991) 227ff.
- 158 Cf. pp. 8–9.
- 159 P. Roussel (1951) 123–227.
- 160 Cf. J. Stroux and L. Wenger (1928) 98–101.
- 161 Ulpian (*Digest*, 50, 4, 8) continues: ‘Indeed they are not appointed as decurions or if appointed do not vote in the curia’ (transl. A. Watson). So there were exceptions. Cf. *Digest*, 50, 2, 11 (Callistratus, first half of the third century): ‘Not only those who are of tender age (*tenerae aetatis*) but also those who are elderly are debarred from becoming decurions. The former are temporarily excused as unable to administer public business (*inhabiles rempublicam tueri*), the latter are permanently excluded. But mature men are not debarred, lest by the release of mature men young men should be burdened by being the only ones left to undertake all public *munera*. For those who are younger than twenty-five may not be made decurions except for some special reason, nor may those who have passed fifty-five [elsewhere sixty, seventy]. Sometimes also account will need to be taken of long established custom in these matter’ (transl. A. Watson); 50, 2, 6, 1; 50, 5, 2 Pr.; *Theodosian Code*, 12, 1, 18, 1.
- 162 On Carthage, cf. *Theodosian Code*, 12, 1, 7 (AD320, age 18). On sons of veterans, cf. *Theodosian Code*, 7, 22, 2 Pr (AD326, between 20 and 25); 12, 1, 18, 1 (AD329 age 25); 12, 1, 19 (AD331 age 18); 7, 22, 4 (AD343) and 12, 1, 35 (AD343, age 16). Cf. M. Nuyens (1964) *passim*.
- 163 Cf. B. Kübler (1928) 433ff.; A.H.M. Jones (1964) II, 532ff.
- 164 For the administrative system and the general atmosphere in the Roman civil service, cf. A.H.M. Jones (1964) II, 563ff.; F.S. Pederson (1970) 161–213. Generally speaking, key positions were certainly not entrusted to young men, as they required serious intellectual training, experience, knowledge of documents— qualities which require a certain age, in antiquity as much as today. Cf. E. Eyben (1981a) 334–5.
- 165 But not the consulate! Cf. T.J.W. Wiedemann (1989) 135–6: ‘We have enough information about the consuls to be able to say that until well into the fifth century, no children seem to have been appointed to that office except for members of the imperial family.

[...] As a rule, even men of noble family cannot have been appointed before their early thirties.'

- 166 Cf. T.E.J. Wiedemann (1989) 106.
- 167 According to Libanius (Or., 35, 5) and John Chrysostom (*De Anna*, 3, 4 PG 54, 658), notables made their children gymnasiarchs, thallopors, agonetes, etc. from the moment they were weaned. Cf. *Theodosian Code*, 12, 1, 19 (AD326, boys of 7 or 8 years); 12, 1, 122 ('persons who began to be decurions immediately they were born').
- 168 H.W. Pleket (1979), as well as T.E.J. Wiedemann (1989) and M. Kleijwegt (1991) 253ff. is aware of the fact; but M. Kleijwegt in particular tries to obscure it: 'In the majority of inscriptions in which minors occur nothing is said about substitution and as a result we are entitled to infer that the minor held office himself' (p. 258). But this is pure speculation and most improbable. Of course, we can underwrite the words of the same scholar (p. 253): 'We do not see children or adolescents holding offices which required political experience: those were reserved for elder statesmen.' But we cannot follow him when he says on the same page that responsible tasks were assigned to teenagers from the age of 16 or 17 on. As proof he refers to Marcus Aurelius Magas, who was head of police in Lycia and died at the age of 18, but this office also could be nominal. Cf. E. Eyben (1981a) 344–5.
- 169 It is quite to be expected that rich freedmen, who were not allowed to hold political offices, also cherished this ambition for their sons. Cf. M.L. Gordon (1931) 65–77; T.E.J. Wiedemann (1989) 136.
- 170 Cf. B. Kübler (1933) 644–51; L. Neesen (1981) 203–35.
- 171 Perhaps there is a connection with the fact that during the later Empire legal minority could end at the age of 20 (cf. p. 8). The *Lex Aelia Sentia* (AD4) required the same age of a master who wished to free a slave by manumission. According to a decree of Valens and Gratian (AD370; cf. pp. 119–20), no student was permitted to remain in Rome after the age of 20, for no one must escape the public burdens longer than that.
- 172 Cf. P. Garnsey (1974) 229ff.
- 173 Basil, *Ep.*, 84 (transl. R.J. Deferrari).
- 174 Dio, 52, 20, 1 (transl. E. Cary).
- 175 *Digest*, 4, 4, 1 Pr. (transl. A. Watson).
- 176 Cf. *JR* 254–64.
- 177 Apuleius, *Apol.*, 66, 4–5. Cf. *JR* 255 n. 160. As an example from the early Empire we may mention Pliny the Younger (cf. p. 77).
- 178 Polybius, 31, 29, 8–10 (transl. W.R. Paton).
- 179 Plutarch, *Cato Mai.*, 15, 3.
- 180 Livy, 38, 52, 11.
- 181 Cicero, *De or.*, 1, 10, 40; 1, 26, 121; 3, 20, 121.

- 182 Cf. *JR* 255–6.
- 183 Plutarch, *Cic.*, 3, 2–4; Gellius, 15, 28 (who wrongly states that Cicero was then 23).
- 184 Cf. A.H.M.Jones (1964) II, 563ff.
- 185 Petronius, 4, 4; 4, 1–2 (transl. M.Heseltine).
- 186 Cf. pp. 141–2.
- 187 Pliny, *Ep.*, 2, 14, 2–4 (transl. B.Radice). B.Baldwin (1976) 221–33 is, in my view, too ready to argue that the early Empire did not know a conflict of generations. This text makes it perfectly clear that such a conflict did exist.
- 188 Cf. p. 227ff.
- 189 Pliny, *Ep.*, 6, 11, 1–3 (transl. B.Radice).
- 190 Quintilian, 11, 1, 68.
- 191 Cicero, *Sull.*, 16, 46–7 (transl. L.E.Lord).
- 192 Cic, *Cael.*, 1, 2; 3, 7–8 (transl. R.Gardner).
- 193 Terence, *Phorm.*, 281–4.
- 194 Plutarch, *Mar.*, 4, 2.
- 195 Cicero, *De or.*, 1, 26, 121.
- 196 Cicero, *Deiot.*, 1, 1 (transl. N.H.Watts).
- 197 Cicero, *Cael.*, 30, 73 (transl. R.Gardner). Cf. *idem*, *Verr.*, (2)3, 1, 3, and *JR* 260 n. 176.
- 198 Pliny, *Ep.*, 1, 18, 3–4 (transl. B.Radice).
- 199 Cicero, *Rosc. Am.*, 11, 30–2; 1, 1–3 (transl. J.H.Freese).
- 200 Plutarch, *Cic.*, 3, 4.
- 201 Suetonius, *Caes.*, 4, 1.
- 202 Cicero, *Cael.*, 19, 47 (transl. R.Gardner).
- 203 Cicero, *Verr.*, (2)3, 1, 3.
- 204 Cicero, *Off.*, 2, 13, 45 (transl. W.Miller).
- 205 Valerius Maximus, 5, 4, 4.
- 206 Quintilian, 12, 7, 3.
- 207 Plutarch, *Luc.*, 1, 2 (transl. B.Perrin).

III THE LEISURE ACTIVITIES OF YOUTH

- 1 Cf. *JR* 137–215.
- 2 Cf. *JR* 137–46, and, in a more general way, E.N.Gardiner (1930); M. I.Finley and H.W.Pleket (1976); H.A.Harris (1976); V.Olivová (1985); M.B.Poliakoff (1987).
- 3 Horace, *S.*, 2, 3, 247–9 (transl. H.R.Fairclough).
- 4 On children's games, cf. A.Hug (1929) 1762–74; J.Väterlein (1976); T.E.J.Wiedemann (1989) 147ff. ('play, like school, prepares the child for adult life, mainly by imitation', p. 147). *Nuces relinquere*, to stop playing with nuts, was synonymous with leaving childhood.

- Cf. Persius, 1, 10 (with scholium); Catullus, 61, 128ff.; Seneca, Ir., 1, 12, 4.
- 5 Horace, *A.P.*, 161–2 (cf. pp. 36–7).
 - 6 References are in *JR* 141 nn. 18–27. Cf. G. Pfister (1977) 48ff.
 - 7 Horace, *C.*, 1, 8 (transl. C.E. Bennett). Cf. the description of the Campus Martius in Strabo, 5, 3, 8.
 - 8 Cf. H.A. Harris (1976) 112ff.
 - 9 Cicero, *Cael.*, 15, 35. Cf. *JR* 142 with n. 31.
 - 10 Ovid, *Ars*, 3, 640.
 - 11 Cf. J.P. V.D. Balsdon (1974) 268ff.
 - 12 *Augustan History, Aur. M.*, 23, 8.
 - 13 Cicero, *Cael.*, 15, 35. Centuries later Symmachus (*Ep.*, 8, 23, 3) still speaks about the *iuvenum procaces natatus* at Baiae.
 - 14 Cf. *JR* 139–41, and, in general, J. Aymard (1951).
 - 15 Pliny, *Pan.*, 81, 2 (transl. B. Radice).
 - 16 Cf. pp. 72ff.
 - 17 Polybius, 31, 29, 3ff. (transl. W.R. Paton). Cf. J. Aymard (1951) 54ff., 485–7.
 - 18 Horace, *C.*, 3, 24, 54ff.
 - 19 *Augustan History, Aur. M.*, 4, 9–10.
 - 20 Paulinus of Pella, 141ff.
 - 21 Symmachus, *Ep.*, 5, 67; 5, 68.
 - 22 Cf. H.-I. Marrou (1965) 104ff., 201ff., 351ff., 364ff.
 - 23 Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.*, 40, 274D (transl. M.B. Poliakoff). Cf. Pliny, *N.H.*, 35, 47, 168: ‘ointment, employed by our young men while ruining the vigour of the mind by exercising their muscles’ (transl. H. Rackham); Seneca, *Ep.*, 88, 18–19; Lucan, 7, 270–2: ‘[the army of Pompey] enlisted from the training-schools of Greece, enfeebled by the practice of the wrestling-ground’ (transl. J.D. Duff). On the gap between the Greek and Roman views of athletics, cf. L. Friedländer (1922) II, 152ff., 158ff.; H.-I. Marrou (1965) 351ff.; E.N. Gardiner (1930) 117ff.; J. Delorme (1960) 433ff.; H.A. Harris (1976) 49ff.; M.B. Poliakoff (1987) 102ff.
 - 24 Cf. *JR* 146 n. 53, and H.A. Harris (1976) 133–41 (the hoop), 146 n. 53, and H.A. Harris (1976) 74–111 (ball-games). Of course, the hoop was a plaything for children too. There were ball-games for young and old (cf. e.g. Martial, 10, 86; 14, 47; Pliny, *Ep.*, 3, 1, 8), but it is evident that the way of playing varied according to the age of the performers. A rather pleasant—and extensive—description of such a ball-game by students (and an older man ‘who had been an excellent player as a youth’) is given in Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.*, 5, 17, 1ff. For an interpretation, cf. H.A. Harris (1976) 97ff.
 - 25 *Augustan History, Ver.*, 2, 10.
 - 26 Symmachus, *Ep.*, 5, 68, 2.

- 27 H.A.Harris (1976) 73.
- 28 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 14, 20, 5–6 (transl. C.H. Moore/J. Jackson).
- 29 Cf. *JR* 143–6, and, in general, J.Delorme (1960). In the Greek world the gymnasia had grown from being ‘sports centres’ into centres of intellectual activity, frequented largely by the young. They also became widespread in the Roman world. Towards the end of the Republic they changed in character: they were no longer centres of intellectual activity, and the pedagogical and moral value of the various physical exercises was considerably played down. The central activity now became bathing, something which had been purely marginal in earlier Greek establishments and was always seen as separate from athletics as such.
- 30 Quintilian, 1, 11, 15.
- 31 Martial, 7, 32.
- 32 It is remarkable that there is almost no talk of athletics in the numerous texts which inform us of student life in late antiquity. Cf. H.-I.Marrou (1965) 186. From Libanius, *Ep.*, 843; 1017; 1330, 3 we can deduce, however, that athletics sometimes interfered with studies. Cf. P.Petit (1956) 148–9.
- 33 Galen, *Protr.*, 2; 9; 11; 14.
- 34 Epictetus, *Diss.*, 3, 15, 5–6; *Ench.*, 29, 3.
- 35 H.W.Pleket (1974) 57–87; (1976) 49–89. Cf. M.B.Poliakoff (1987) 129ff.
- 36 Artemidorus, 2, 20. Cf. H.W.Pleket (1974) 75ff.; M.B.Poliakoff (1987) 131.
- 37 The age-limit between children and men was probably 20; if there were three age-groups, the children were presumably between 12 and 16, the ‘beardless youths’ (cf. Horace’s *inberbus iuvenis* in *A.P.*, 161, pp. 36–7) between 16 and 20, the men older than 20. Cf. C.A. Forbes (1933) 2; E.N.Gardiner (1930) 41; H.A.Harris (1976) 20, 253–4; M.B.Poliakoff (1987) 20.
- 38 Cf. the comment in M.B.Poliakoff (1987) 127: ‘Whatever the reason [of his appointment], his membership [of the prestigious literary coterie of Alexandria] argues that he was hardly the mindless hulk that Galen’s polemic describes as the normal make-up of heavy athletes.’
- 39 CIG 14,1102; 1104 (transl. H.A.Harris (1979) 127–8). Cf. H.W. Pleket (1974) 58, 80 n. 4; M.B.Poliakoff (1981) 125–7, 184–5.
- 40 Cf. *JR* 146–52 and, in general, L.Friedländer (1922) II, 163–90; G. Wille (1967); *idem* (1977).
- 41 H.-I.Marrou (1965) 80ff., 205ff.
- 42 Polybius, 31, 25, 4 (cf. p. 22).
- 43 Macrobius, *Sat.*, 3, 14, 4–7. Cf. U.E. Paoli (1972) 544; G. Wille (1977) 83ff.

- 44 Quintilian, 1, 10, 9ff; 1, 11, 19; 1, 10, 31. Cf. G.Wille (1967) 406ff., 449ff.
- 45 Seneca, *Contr.*, 1 Pr. 8 (cf. pp. 98–9).
- 46 Suetonius, *Nero*, 20, 1–2.
- 47 Libanius, *Or.*, 3, 11.
- 48 Augustine, *Ord.*, 1, 8, 22 PL 32, 987. Cf. p. 183 (Licentius as a poet).
- 49 Cf. *jR* 155–71.
- 50 Tacitus, *D.*, 28,2; 29, 3–4 (transl. W.Peterson).
- 51 Cf. *jR* 156–61, and, in general, L.Friedländer (1922) II, 21ff.; P. Veyne (1976). On late antiquity, cf. A.Cameron (1973); *idem* (1976).
- 52 Juvenal, 11, 201–2. For the circus as an excellent meeting-place for men and women, cf. Ovid, *Ars*, 1, 91–2; 1, 135ff.
- 53 Suetonius, *Cal.*, 55, 7; Dio, 59, 14, 5.
- 54 Herodian, 3, 10, 1ff.; Dio, 76, 7, 1ff.
- 55 Augustine, *Conf.*, 6, 7, 11–12. Cf. p. 96 (his passion for the amphitheatre).
- 56 Libanius, *Or.*, 1, 5; 3, 12; 35, 13.
- 57 Procopius, *Pers.*, 1, 24, 2., Cf. *idem*, *Anecd.*, 7, 1.
- 58 A.Cameron (1976) 75ff., 79, 99–100, 271–2, 342–3 (with references from Procopius and others). Cf. *idem* (1973) 237: ‘We may compare the unrest of the youth with which we have become so familiar in our own day.’
- 59 A.Cameron (1976) 77ff. This scholar is of the opinion that proof is furnished by a text of the lawyer Callistratus, where tough measures were adopted against the *iuvenes* who created havoc in the theatre. Cf. p. 94.
- 60 Suetonius, *Caes.*, 39, 4; *Aug.*, 43, 4.
- 61 Suetonius, *Nero*, 22, 1–2.
- 62 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 14, 14, 1ff. (transl. C.H.Moore/J.Jackson).
- 63 Suetonius, *Caes.*, 39, 2; *Aug.*, 43, 3. Cf. Dio 54, 4; Tacitus, *Hist.*, 2, 62.
- 64 On this tour, cf. K.R.Bradley (1978) 61–72.
- 65 Suetonius, *Nero*, 20,6 (transl. J.C.Rolfe). Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.*, 14, 15, 9–10; Dio, 61, 20, 3–4, and *jR* 166 with n. 135.
- 66 Thus, for example, A.Michel (1966) 162: ‘It rather seems that the young emperor attempted to establish within the city a wholly new way of life, based on peace, on the development of the arts.... What had perhaps been, in this young man, indeed almost a child, a revolt against the established order, a haughty and naive desire to transcend good and evil, to shake and abolish the hypocrisy of adults, was disgraced, ridiculed, presented as the most abject and most vulgar character trait. Vespasian was an old man and a knave, and with him the adults triumphed’ (my transl.). Cf. the scholars discussed in J. Wankenne (1981) 135–52.

- 67 Suetonius, *Nero*, 57, 2.
- 68 Cf. *JR* 161–7, and, in general, L.Friedländer (1922) II, 112–47.
- 69 Tacitus, *D.*, 29, 3–4 (cf. p. 89).
- 70 Pliny, *Ep.*, 7, 24, 4–5.
- 71 Ambrose, *Valent.*, 17 PL 16, 1364.
- 72 Seneca, *Ep.*, 47, 17.
- 73 Gellius, 20, 4, 1–3.
- 74 Libanius, *Or.*, 41, 6–9.
- 75 *Digest*, 48, 19, 28, 3. Mostly these *iuvenes* are seen as members of the *collegia iuvenum* (cf. pp. 112ff.). Cf. H.-I.Marrou (1965) 432, 609 n. 4; A. Cameron (1976) 77; D.Ladage (1979) 343; P.Ginestet (1991) 185–8. Perhaps *iuvenes* played the leading part in the riot of AD59 in the amphitheatre at Pompeii, which resulted in a real massacre. Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.*, 14, 17, and W.O.Moeller (1970) 84–95, whose view is questioned in P.Castrén (1975) 33.
- 76 Cf. p. 92.
- 77 Livy, 7, 2, 1ff.; Valerius Maximus, 2, 4, 4. For a sociological approach, cf. J.-P.Morel (1969) 208–52, for whom the *iuventus* in early Rome formed a closed social group marked by, for instance, pungent mockery.
- 78 Suetonius, *Tib.*, 35, 3. Cf. *JR* 165 n. 133.
- 79 Cf. *JR* 167–71, and, in general, L.Friedländer (1922) II, 50–112; G. Ville (1982).
- 80 L.Robert (1971) *passim*.
- 81 Seneca, *Ep.*, 95, 33.
- 82 Pliny, *Pan.*, 33, 1 (transl. B.Radice).
- 83 Tacitus, *D.*, 29, 3–4 (cf. p. 89).
- 84 Flavius Josephus, *Ant. Iud.*, 19, 130.
- 85 Apuleius, *Apol.*, 98, 7.
- 86 Libanius, *Or.*, 1, 5.
- 87 Augustine, *Conf.*, 6, 7, 11–12.
- 88 Augustine, *Conf.*, 6, 8, 13 (transl. H.Chadwick).
- 89 L.Friedländer (1922) II, 62.
- 90 Seneca, *Ep.*, 99, 12–13.
- 91 Seneca, *Ep.*, 87, 9. Cf. *JR* 170–1 with nn. 145–50.
- 92 Suetonius, *Cal.*, 54, 2; Dio, 59, 5, 2–4.
- 93 *Augustan History*, *Comm.*, 12, 10–12; *Aur. M.*, 19, 5; Herodian, 1, 15, 1–6; Dio, 72, 17, 2; 72, 19, 1–6. Cf. L.Friedländer (1922) II, 61–2.
- 94 Cf. *JR* 171–98.
- 95 Cf. *JR* 180–92. Cf. H.Herter (1959) 620–50; L.Hermans (1990) 73ff. (on effeminate fellows).
- 96 A.Cameron (1976) 76–7.
- 97 Polybius, 31, 25, 2–7 (cf. p. 22).
- 98 Diodorus of Sicily, 37, 3, 2–5. Cf. Macrobius, *Sat.*, 3, 16, 15–16.

- 99 Seneca, *Contr.*, 1 Pr. 8–10 (transl. M. Winterbottom).
- 100 Manilius, 5, 143ff. (transl. G.P. Goold).
- 101 Tertullian, *Cult. fem.*, 2, 8 PL 1, 1325. Cf. L.B. Lawler (1929–30) 23.
In fact neither Manilius nor Tertullian refers to the age of these fads,
but there can be no doubt that both mainly refer to young men.
- 102 Gregory of Nazianzen, C., 2, 1, 45, 303ff. PG 37, 1375.
- 103 Cf. p. 171.
- 104 Quintilian, 11, 1, 31–2 (transl. H.E. Butler). Cf. p. 152.
- 105 Cicero, *Cael.*, 31, 77 (cf. p. 19); *Rab. Post.*, 10, 26.
- 106 Epictetus, *Diss.*, 3, 1, 1 and 13.
- 107 Cf. pp. 98–9 (Procopius, Manilius).
- 108 John Chrysostom, *Matth.*, 49, 5–6 PG 58, 501–4.
- 109 Cf. *JR* 186–7.
- 110 Seneca, *Ep.*, 114, 21 (transl. R.M. Gummere). The same criticism
was already vented in the second century BC: cf. Gellius, 6, 12, 4–5;
Macrobius, *Sat.*, 3, 17, 3–5.
- 111 Seneca, *Contr.*, 1 Pr. 8–9 (cf. pp. 98–9). Cf. *JR* 187 n. 200.
- 112 Seneca, *Ben.*, 6, 38, 3.
- 113 References are in *JR* 187–8.
- 114 Epictetus, *Diss.*, 3, 1, 35 (transl. W.A. Oldfather). Cf. *JR* 189–90.
- 115 Cf. *JR* 188–9.
- 116 Seneca, *Ep.*, 114, 21; 115, 2 (transl. R.M. Gummere).
- 117 References are in e.g. H. Blümner (1911) 271 nn. 8–9.
- 118 Cicero, *Att.*, 1, 14, 5; 1, 16, 11. Cf. J. Granarolo (1958) 499ff., and *JR*
189 n. 212.
- 119 Cf. *JR* 190–1.
- 120 Terence, *Andr.*, 55ff. (transl. J. Sargeant).
- 121 Sallust, *Cat.*, 14, 6.
- 122 Pliny, *Ep.*, 9, 12 (transl. B. Radice).
- 123 Paulinus of Pella, 141ff. (transl. H.G.E. White). Cf. *JR* 140–1.
- 124 Cf. pp. 83–4.
- 125 Quintilian, 9, 4, 113.
- 126 Juvenal, 1, 58–62. Cf. the comments of J.E.B. Mayor, L. Friedländer
and E. Courtney *ad locum*.
- 127 Cf. *JR* 171–5.
- 128 Cf. p. 16.
- 129 Terence, *Ad.*, 101–2.
- 130 Ps.-Quintilian, *Decl. mai.*, 9, 10.
- 131 Polybius, 31, 25, 4 (cf. p. 22).
- 132 Plautus, *Most.*, 959–61.
- 133 Cicero, *Cael.*, 28, 67; *Att.*, 1, 16, 11; *Cat.*, 2, 5, 10 (transl.
L.E. Lord).
- 134 Seneca, *Ir.*, 3, 25, 2; *Ep.*, 95, 13; 99, 13; 122, 6.
- 135 Libanius, *Or.*, 62, 24–5.

- 136 Livy, 40, 7, 2.
- 137 Cf. *JR* 192–8.
- 138 Horace, *A.P.*, 164 (cf. pp. 36–7).
- 139 Ps.-Sallust, *ad Caes.*, 1, 5, 5; 1, 7, 2 (transl. J.C.Rolfe).
- 140 Cf. E.Eyben (1985) 486ff; D.Daube (1969) 75–91; Y.Thomas (1982) 527–80.
- 141 Cf. B.Rawson (1986) 17. We have to take into account also that, as R.P.Saller (1986) 7–22 has demonstrated, most children must have been *sui iuris* at an early age because of late male marriage and low life-expectancy.
- 142 Cicero, *Att.*, 12, 32, 2; 14, 7, 2 (transl. E.O.Winstedt).
- 143 Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 16, 12B (cf. p. 14). Cf. *JR* 196 with nn. 243–4.
- 144 Cf. pp. 7–8.
- 145 E.g. Horace, *S.*, 1, 2, 15–17. Cf. *JR* 197 with nn. 245–7.
- 146 Cf. D. Daube (1947) 261–311; *idem* (1969) 89.
- 147 Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 16, 12B (cf. p. 14); Juvenal, 11, 201–2 (cf. p. 89). Cf. *JR* 197 with nn. 250–1.
- 148 Macrobius, *S.*, 3, 17, 4; John Chrysostom, *Matt.*, 49, 5–6 PG 58, 501–4 (cf. p. 101). Cf. W.A.Krenkel (1979a) 181; *idem* (1988b) 195.
- 149 E.g. Horace, *S.*, 2, 5. Cf. *JR* 198 with n. 254.
- 150 E.g. Tacitus, *Hist.*, 4, 42, 5–6. Cf. *JR* 198 with n. 255.
- 151 E.g. Seneca, *Ep.*, 99, 12–13; 87, 9 (cf. p. 97).
- 152 E.g. Suetonius, *Nero*, 26, 1–4 (cf. p. 109).
- 153 Plutarch, *Caes.*, 19, 2. Cf. *JR* 198 with n. 256.
- 154 Cf. Cicero, *Cael.*, 16, 38; 15, 36; 21, 53.
- 155 Sallust, *Cat.*, 14, 5–6 (cf. pp. 56–7).
- 156 Suetonius, *Caes.*, 27, 3 (transl. J.C.Rolfe). Cf. *JR* 198.
- 157 Cf. *JR* 175–80. On vandalism in classical Greece, cf. D.F.W.Van Lennep (1961–2) 186–97; H.van Looy (1990) 71–125.
- 158 Cf. pp. 54–6.
- 159 Livy, 3, 13; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 10, 7.
- 160 Plautus, *Amph.*, 153ff. Cf. *idem*, *Trin.*, 313–16, and *Stich*, 606.
- 161 Apuleius, *Met.*, 2, 18, 3–5 (transl. W.Adlington/S.Gaselee).
- 162 Procopius, *Anecd.*, 7, 15–21 (transl. H.B.Dewing). It is more than likely that these offenders were young men. Cf. A.Cameron (1976) 75ff.
- 163 Juvenal, 3, 278ff. (transl. G.G.Ramsay).
- 164 Cf. p. 124.
- 165 Suetonius, *Nero*, 26, 1–4 (transl. J.C.Rolfe); Tacitus, *Ann.*, 13, 25, 1–3; Pliny, *N.H.*, 13, 43, 136; Dio Cassius, 61, 8, 1; 61, 9, 2–4.
- 166 Cf. *JR* 177 n. 172, 178 n. 175.
- 167 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 13, 25, 2; 13, 47, 5.
- 168 For the dangers of *otium*, cf. p. 23.

- 169 Augustine, *Conf.*, 2, 4, 9ff. (transl. H.Chadwick). On this epistide, cf. E.Vischer (1921) 183–94; G.Scerbo (1952) 29–48; J.J.O’Meara (1954) 49ff.; C.Ferrari (1970) 233–42; P.Courcelle (1971) 141–50.
- 170 Augustine, *Conf.*, 2, 3, 7–8 (transl. H.Chadwick).
- 171 Cf. *JR* 234–7. For an extensive and annotated bibliography. cf. M. Jaczynowska (1978) 5–16, 114–20; P.Ginestet (1991) 9–19, 300–7. Cf. J.P.Morel (1976) 667–73 (with a survey of the problems and questions involved); G.Pfister (1977); L.Giuliano (1979) 147–50 with nn. 6ff.; J.-P.Néraudau (1979) 371–7; D.Ladage (1979) 319–46.
- 172 On the *ephebi*, cf. e.g. Ch. Pélékidis (1962); on the *neoi*, cf. C.A. Forbes (1933). Cf. M.P.Nilsson (1955) (the post-classical associations of *ephebi* and *neoi* as centres of education for well-to-do youths). As early as c. 100BC Roman youths were members of the Athenian *ephebi* (*ibid.*, 26).
- 173 Cf. P.Lambrechts (1948) 355–71; G. Pfister (1977) *passim*; L. Giuliano (1979) 145–61; P.Ginestet (1991) 84–93.
- 174 Cf. p. 8.
- 175 Suetonius, *Aug.*, 38, 2. One can compare them with the *praetextati* of Canusium, privileged young men who were allowed to witness the council at work. Cf. P.Garnsey (1974) 243ff.; M. Kleijwegt (1991) 304ff.
- 176 Augustus, *Res gest.*, 19, 2.
- 177 Valerius Maximus, 2, 2, 9. Cf. P.Veyne (1960) 100ff.; G.Pfister (1977) 37ff., 40ff.
- 178 Dio Cassius, 55, 13, 6.
- 179 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 2, 83, 5. Cf. Suetonius, *Dom.*, 4, 5.
- 180 Scholia on Persius, 1, 134, and Juvenal, 5, 117.
- 181 Suetonius, *Aug.*, 31, 6.
- 182 Dio, 52, 26, 1–2 (transl. E.Cary).
- 183 This is *communis opinio*. But see D.Ladage (1979) 319–46.
- 184 Cf. S.L.Mohler (1937) 459ff.; H.W.Pleket (1969) 289–91; M. Jaczynowska (1978) 39ff.; D.Ladage (1979) 326–7; P.Ginestet (1991) 128–9.
- 185 Cf. *JR* 154–5; R.Egger (1915) 115–29; S.L.Mohler (1937) 442ff.; H. Galstener (1981) 410–18; P.Ginestet (1991) 151ff. For children there was the *ludus Troiae*: cf. *JR* 115 with n. 87; J.-P.Morel (1976) 671–2; G.Pfister (1977) 23ff.
- 186 M.Rostovtzeff (1905) 59–93. Cf. the scholars mentioned in J.-P. Morel (1976) 669 n. 23, and G.Pfister (1977).
- 187 Cf. M.Jaczynowska (1978) 70–1.
- 188 M. Jaczynowska (1978) 63 (my transl.). Cf. e.g. R.MacMullen (1963) 135: ‘[the *collegia* in Italy] certainly served no military purpose...[a lot] smacks strongly of the army. It should not mislead however.’
- 189 S.L.Mohler (1937) 442–79.

- 190 Cf. the scholars mentioned in J.-P. Morel (1976) 696 n. 25.
- 191 Cf. H. W. Pleket (1969) 281–98 (on the *collegia* of Vence).
- 192 H.-I. Marrou (1965) 433 (my transl.).
- 193 C. Jullian (1900) 784; H.-I. Marrou (1965) 433.
- 194 J.-P. Morel (1976) 671 (my transl.).
- 195 Cf. *JR* 199–215 with bibliography on p. 199 n. 261, esp. J. W. H. Walden (1970), esp. 296–333; A. Müller (1910) 292–317; W. W. Capes (1977), esp. 96ff.; C. A. Forbes (1932–3) 413–26; F. H. Cramer (1939) 204–28; P. Wolf (1952); C. Kunderewicz (1972) 577–88.
- 196 Cf. *JR* 212–15, and L. W. Daly (1950) 40–58. On Cicero's son Marcus at Athens, cf. pp. 210–11. For student life in Rome after the fall of the Roman Empire, Ennodius is an important source: cf. *JR* 213–14, and S. Léglise (1890) 209ff.
- 197 Cf. pp. 134, 137, 151–2, 157–8.
- 198 Cf. L. Petit de Julleville (1868); F. Schemmel (1908a) 494–513; A. Bouché-Leclercq (1909) 741–63.
- 199 Cf. F. Schemmel (1909) 438–57; P. Courcelle (1935) 185–223; A. W. Argyle (1974) 348–50 (Alexandria); F. Schemmel (1908b) 147–68 (Constantinople); P. Collinet (1925); F. Schemmel (1923) 236–40; J. F. Gilliam (1974) 147–50 (Beirut); F. Schemmel (1922) 620–4; (1925) 1277–80; A. Knauber (1968) 182–203 (Caesarea); A. Harrent (1898); A.-J. Festugière (1959) 91–179 (Antioch). On Libanius, cf. also F. Schemmel (1907) 52–69; P. Wolf (1952); *idem* (1954) 231–42; P. Petit (1956); A.-J. Festugière (1959) 91–180; A. Treloar (1973) 51–67; M. Pinto (1974) 146–79; A. F. Norman (1983) 150–69.
- 200 Cf. F. Schemmel (1920–1) 7–8, 982–4.
- 201 Cf. F. Schemmel (1927a) 1342–4.
- 202 Cf. Strabo, 4, 1, 5. Cf. L. W. Daly (1950) 55–6.
- 203 Cf. A. Müller (1910) 298–9; P. Petit (1956) 139–44; A.-J. Festugière (1959) 104–5, 187 n. 4, 477 n. 1.
- 204 Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.*, 43, 15 PG 36, 513 (transl. L. P. McCauley).
- 205 Eunapius, *V.S.*, 485 (transl. W. C. Wright).
- 206 Libanius, *Or.*, 1, 19 and 16 (transl. A. F. Norman).
- 207 Cf. M.-A. Kugener (1904–5) 345–56.
- 208 Augustine, *Conf.*, 3, 3, 6 (transl. H. Chadwick).
- 209 Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.*, 43, 16 PG 36, 516 (transl. L. P. McCauley).
- 210 Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.*, 43, 16 (transl. L. P. McCauley).
- 211 Olympiodorus, quoted in Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 80 p. 60 (with a description of the initiation in student life). Cf. J. W. H. Walden (1970) 201–303.
- 212 Libanius, *Ep.*, 1458, 1.

- 213 Exceptions were the later Church Father Basil the Great (Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.*, 43, 16 PG 36, 517; cf. p. 221), because he was respected very much, and Eunapius (*V.S.*, 486), because he was ill.
- 214 Cf. Augustine, *Conf.*, 5, 8, 14 (cf. p. 123).
- 215 *Digest, Praef. const. omni.*, 9.
- 216 *Theodosian Code*, 14,9 (transl. C.Pharr). Cf. C.Kunderewicz (1972) 577–88.
- 217 H.W.Pleket (1979) 188.
- 218 Eusebius, *Mart. Pal.*, 4, 2 SChr. 77.
- 219 Libanius, *Or.*, 3, 6; 1, 19 and 22 (transl. A.F.Norman).
- 220 Himerius, *Or.*, 22, 7.
- 221 Zacharias, *V. Severi*, p. 52 Kugener.
- 222 Libanius, *Or.*, 1, 19–21 (transl. A.F.Norman); *Ep.*, 715, 3.
- 223 Libanius *Or.*, 3, 12 and 21–3.
- 224 Eunapius, *V.S.*, 483–5.
- 225 Himerius, *Or.*, 22.
- 226 Augustine, *Conf.*, 5, 8, 14 (transl. H.Chadwick).
- 227 Libanius, *Or.*, 1, 25 and 85.
- 228 Cf. J.W.H.Walden (1970) 326–7; A.-J.Festugière (1959) 107ff.
- 229 Libanius, *Or.*, 1,21–2; 58, 4–5; 58, 18.
- 230 This is the reason why even some ‘university professors’ did not hesitate to use the rod to beat good sense into their students. Cf. Libanius, *Ep.*, 1330, and J.W.H.Walden (1970) 324ff.; A.-J. Festugière (1959) 111ff. Himerius (*Or.*, 15), on the contrary, is of the opinion that only sweet and gentle words can be helpful: ‘I detest those guardians of youth who cannot lead their flock, like shepherds, by the music of their pipe, but threaten them with blows and whippings. My sheep, my nurslings—may I never scare them with a frown—are to be guided by my eloquence to the groves and meadows of the Muses. To lead them I require no rod, but only melody’ (transl. W.W.Capes (1977) 114–15).
- 231 Quintilian, 2, 8, 9. Cf. *ibid.*, 2, 6, 3.
- 232 Augustine, *Conf.*, 3, 3, 6 (cf. pp. 117–18); 5, 8, 14; 5, 12, 22.
- 233 Libanius, *Or.*, 43, 6ff.
- 234 Libanius, *Or.*, 3, 11–14.
- 235 Libanius, *Or.*, 19, 29; 22, 6; 22, 11; 23, 20; 23, 26–7; 34, 6–14. Cf. P.Petit (1955) 238ff.
- 236 Cf. pp. 119–20.
- 237 *Codex Iustinianus*, 10, 49(50)1. Cf. *ibid.*, 10, 39(40)2 (Hadrian and Alexander Severus about studies that lasted ten years). Examples of long-lasting studies are in *JR* 212 n. 284. Cf. A.Müller (1910) 229; H.-I.Marrou (1965) 305–6, 436, 578 n. 34; W.W.Capes (1977) 119.

- 238 The speech delivered AD238 by the Christian Gregory Thaumaturgus when leaving the school of Origenes at Caesarea is preserved: cf. A.Brinkman (1901) 55–76; F.Schemmel (1925) 1277–80.
- 239 Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.*, 43, 24 PG 36, 528–9 (transl. L.P. McCauley).

IV YOUTHFUL THINKING

- 1 Cf. A.Gwynn (1926); H.-I.Marrou (1965); P.Blomenkamp (1966) 502–59; M.L.Clarke (1971); H.T.Johann (1976); S.F.Bonner (1977); T.E.J.Wiedemann (1989) 143ff. On education in the city states of the Empire, cf. H.W.Pleket (1981) 155–78; M.Kleijwegt (1991) 75–133. On Christian education, cf. M.L.W.Laistner (1978); H.-I.Marrou (1965) 458ff.; A.Quacquarelli (1974); J.den Boeft (1981) 210–28. Extensive bibliographies on education are provided in H.-T.Johann (1976), and in M.Karras and J.Wiesehöfer (1981).
- 2 At about the age of 7.
- 3 Plutarch, *Cato Ma.*, 20, 4–7 (transl. B.Perrin).
- 4 Cf. pp. 145ff.
- 5 A girl like this had the choice between marriage with, or the death of, the rapist.
- 6 Tacitus, *D.*, 35, 1–5 (transl. W.Peterson).
- 7 Cf. *jR* 273–91.
- 8 E.g. Pliny, *Ep.*, 7, 22, 2 (*amat studia, ut solent pauperes*); Petronius, 46, 5–7. Cf. *jR* 275 n. 11.
- 9 Cicero, *Fin.*, 5, 18, 48 (transl. H.Rackham).
- 10 Cf. pp. 142ff.
- 11 Apuleius, *Apol.*, 5, 1; 23, 1–4.
- 12 Libanius, *Or.*, 1, 4–5.
- 13 Cf. Horace, *S.*, 1, 6, 65ff. (Horace's father); Augustine *Ac.*, 2, 2, 3–4 (Romanianus as Augustine's Maecenas); Libanius, *Ep.*, 550, 1; 552, 12 (the teacher who helps poor students).
- 14 Eunapius, *V.S.*, 487. Other examples of poor students are in *jR* 276 n. 16.
- 15 Seneca, *N.Q.*, 1, 17, 4; *Ep.*, 108, 27. Another typical example was Nicolaus of Damascus, Augustus' biographer. Encouraged by his father, he passionately devoted himself as a youth to all kinds of subjects: grammar, rhetoric, music, mathematics, philosophy (*Fr. Gr. Hist.*, 90F131–2).
- 16 Galen, II, 179 (ed. Kühn). For Galen's own eagerness to learn, cf. p. 136.
- 17 Cf. p. 11.
- 18 Augustine, *Ep.*, 117–18. On Dioscorus' correspondence with Augustine, cf. J.H.Koopmans (1949).

- 19 References are in *jR* 278 nn. 23–5.
- 20 Gellius, 7, 13.
- 21 Gellius, 18, 2. Cf. *jR* 278–9 with n. 27.
- 22 Cf. *jR* 373 (Marcus Aurelius), 280–1 (Julian). Other examples are in *jR* 280 n. 31.
- 23 Augustine, *Conf.*, 4, 8, 13. Cf. p. 220.
- 24 Augustine, *Conf.*, 4, 16, 30–1 (transl. H. Chadwick).
- 25 Cf. *jR* 281–91.
- 26 Cicero, *Brut.*, 90, 308. Cf. Apuleius, *Flor.*, 20, 4.
- 27 Cf. *jR* 282–3.
- 28 Plutarch, *Prof. virt.*, 7, 78E.
- 29 Cf. *jR* 286–7.
- 30 Cf. Plutarch, *E ap. Delph.*, 7, 387F.
- 31 Plutarch, *Aud.*, 10, 43A; 11, 43BC.
- 32 Cf. *jR* 287–8. On medical schooling, cf. I.E. Drabkin (1944) 333–51; D.E. Eichholz (1951) 65ff.; H.-I. Marrou (1965) 288–91, 372–3; J. Kollesch (1979) 507–13; M. Kleijwegt (1991) 135–63 (with examples of young physicians).
- 33 Galen, X, 457 (ed. Kühn).
- 34 References are in *jR* 287–8. Cf. J. Ilberg (1971) 361ff.; G. Sarton (1954) 15ff.; G. W. Bowersock (1969) 60ff.
- 35 Cf. *jR* 283–5.
- 36 Pliny, *Ep.*, 6, 20, 5.
- 37 Suetonius, *Gramm.*, 2, 1–2.
- 38 Gellius, 18, 2, 7; 12; 14.
- 39 Gellius, 15, 9, 1ff.
- 40 Cf. *jR* 288–90. For the study of law, cf. B. Kübler (1914) 394–405; P. Collinet (1925) 207ff.; C. Pharr (1939) 257–70; H.-I. Marrou (1965) 354, 418–21; F. Wieacker (1964) 94ff.; J. Kodrebski (1976) 177–96; D. Liebs (1976) 197–286.
- 41 Cicero, *Lae.*, 1, 1: ‘Upon assuming the *toga virilis* I had been introduced by my father to Scaevola with the understanding that, so far as I could and he would permit, I should never leave the old man’s side. And so it came to pass that, in my desire to gain greater profit from his legal skill, I made it a practice to commit to memory many of his learned opinions and many, too, of his brief and pointed sayings’ (transl. W. A. Falconer).
- 42 Cf. Petronius, 46, 7–8.
- 43 Quintilian, 12, 3, 9 and 11 (cf. p. 160).
- 44 Libanius, *Or.*, 4, 18; 62, 21–3. On Libanius’ aversion to the study of law (and stenography, Latin), cf. P. Wolf (1954) 239ff.; A.-J. Festugière (1959) 92 with n. 3, 410–12, 507–8.
- 45 On this intellectual centre, cf. P. Collinet (1925).
- 46 Libanius, *Or.*, 43, 4.

- 47 On the imperial administration, cf. A.H.M.Jones (1964) II, 563ff.; E.Eyben (1981) 334–5.
- 48 Cf. H.-I.Marrou (1965) 448–50.
- 49 Libanius, *Ep.*, 1124,6.
- 50 Cf. *jR* 290–1. On study abroad, cf. L.W.Daly (1950) 40–58; H. Wagenvoort (1952–3) 2–8, 21–32; W.H.Gross (1983) 47–84.
- 51 Philostratus, *V, Ap.*, 1,18 (transl. F.C.Connybeare).
- 52 Apuleius, *Apol.*, 72, 5.
- 53 Lucian, *Alex.*, 44.
- 54 Cicero, *Fin.*, 5, 2, 5 (transl. H.Rackham).
- 55 Fronto, *Ad M. Caes.*, 4, 4 (transl. C.R.Haines).
- 56 Cf. *jR* 292–338.
- 57 Cf. *jR* 292–8.
- 58 Cf. *jR* 292–3.
- 59 Suet., *Gramm.*, 25, 1.
- 60 Cicero, *De or.*, 3, 24, 93–4. Cf. Tacitus, *D.*, 35, 1–5.
- 61 Thus e.g. G.Bloch (1903) 68–73; R.Pichon (1904) 37–41; A.Gwynn (1926) 59ff.; H.-I.Marrou (1965) 370–1; J.-M.David (1979) 135–81. But see S.F.Bonner (1977) 71ff.: ‘Crassus was determined to put a stop to the recruitment of young advocates who [by their blustering and bullying methods] could become a dangerous element in the Roman courts, and who would be likely to become all the more numerous if they could learn their trade in Latin’ (p. 74); A. Manfredini (1976) 99–148 (banishment on moral grounds).
- 62 Cf. G.Kennedy (1972) 112.
- 63 Possibly hardly 15. Thus G.Kennedy (1972) 107ff.
- 64 Cf. H.von Arnim (1898) 132ff.; A.D.Leeman (1963) 364ff.; G.Kennedy (1972) 553ff.; G.W.Bowersock (1969) and *idem* (1974).
- 65 Philostratus, *V.S.*, 1, 21, 520. Other examples are in *jR* 296–7.
- 66 Cf. p. 13.
- 67 Lucian, *Somn.*, 1ff. Cf. *jR* 296 n. 15.
- 68 Lucian, *Somn.*, 18 (transl. A.M.Harmon).
- 69 Cf. *jR* 298–304.
- 70 Cf. pp. 224 (Cato Major), 153–4 (Hortensius), 224 (Cicero).
- 71 Tacitus, *D.*, 7, 3.
- 72 Quintilian, 10, 1, 122.
- 73 Pliny, *Ep.*, 7, 20, 4.
- 74 Pliny, *Ep.*, 4, 16, 2.
- 75 Cf. C.Knapp (1928) 49–53; M.L.Clarke (1968) 18–22 (on Cicero’s education as a boy); G.Rolin (1979–80) 335–46, 43–61. Cf. *jR* 300 n. 31.
- 76 Cicero, *De or.*, 2, 1, 1ff.
- 77 Cicero, in Suetonius, *Gramm.*, 26, 1.
- 78 Cicero, *Brut.*, 89, 304ff. (transl. G.L.Hendrickson).

- 79 Cf. Cicero, *De or.*, 1, 34, 154, and *jR* 350.
- 80 Cf. n. 41.
- 81 Cicero, *Brut.*, 56, 207.
- 82 Cf. p. 163.
- 83 Cicero, *Brut.*, 90, 309.
- 84 Cicero, *Brut.*, 90, 308.
- 85 Cicero, *Brut.*, 90, 310.
- 86 Cicero, *Brut.*, 90, 311.
- 87 Cf. pp. 77ff.
- 88 Cicero, *Brut.*, 90, 312.
- 89 On this period in Cicero's life, cf. H.J.Mette (1965) 10–27; G.Rolin (1979) 559–82.
- 90 Cicero, *Brut.*, 91, 314.
- 91 Plutarch, *Cic.*, 3, 4. Cf. Aurelius Victor, 4, 1.
- 92 Cicero, *Brut.*, 91, 316 (transl. G.L.Hendrickson). Cf. L.W.Daly (1950) 46–7. On Cicero's stay on Rhodes, cf. M.van den Bruwaene (1958–9) 65–71.
- 93 Cf. G.Kennedy (1972) 107ff. Cf. *jR* 303–4.
- 94 Cicero, *De or.*, 1, 2, 5.
- 95 M.L.Clarke (1966) 53.
- 96 Cicero, *Inv.*, 1, 1 (transl. H.M.Hubbell). One can compare with the 'thinking' Heracles (cf. p. 13) and Lysiteles (cf. p. 234).
- 97 K.Büchner (1962) 184.
- 98 Cf. *jR* 305–22.
- 99 Cf. p. 130.
- 100 But see L.P.Wilkinson (1974) 7: 'we have heard too often that argument about academic studies having no relation to "real life", and the kind of person who uses it nowadays should be a warning against condemning the rhetoricians out of hand'.
- 101 Cf. G.Kennedy (1972) 336: 'Most of the subjects of declamation were, of course, designed to be exciting and to interest the young. Many of them are built around problems of adolescence and young manhood.'
- 102 Cf. the discussion, with references to modern scholars (e.g., R.E.K. Pemberton (1932–3) 32–43; E.P.Parks (1945) *passim*; H.-I.Marrou (1965) 303ff., 416ff.; G.Kennedy (1972) 330ff.), in *jR* 311–14.
- 103 Petronius, 2, 2–4 (transl. M.Heseltine).
- 104 Cf. pp. 152ff., 165ff.
- 105 G.Kennedy (1972) 333.
- 106 Cf. E.Eyben (1968) 54ff.
- 107 E.g. Quintilian, 2, 2, 9–12. Cf. p. 150.
- 108 J.W.Duff (1968) 28.
- 109 G.Kennedy (1972) 336.
- 110 Quintilian, 2, 10, 4–6 (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 111 G.Kennedy (1972) 334–5.

- 112 Quintilian, 1, Pr. 7.
- 113 Philostratus, *V.S.*, 1, 22, 523.
- 114 Libanius, *Or.*, 3, 17.
- 115 Fronto, *De eloquentia*, 3, 5.
- 116 Fronto, *De eloquentia*, 3, 4.
- 117 Fronto, *De eloquentia*, 3, 4; 4, 3 (transl. C.R.Haynes).
- 118 Petronius, 4, 4.
- 119 Quintilian, 10, 3, 11–15 (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 120 Quintilian, 10, 5, 21–3; 2, 4, 15–16.
- 121 Quintilian, 3, 8, 70.
- 122 Quintilian, 10, 5, 17. Cf. *idem*, 12, 6, 3ff.; 12, 11, 15–16; Libanius, *Or.*, 1, 27.
- 123 Quintilian, 2, 2, 9–12.
- 124 Of course, this was not always the case, and declamation could be something of an ordeal. Thus Libanius (*Chriae*, 3) draws a picture of the rhetorician frowning on his high throne while his pupil approaches, in fear and trembling, to pronounce his declamation. Cf. M.L.Clarke (1971) 43.
- 125 Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.*, 9, 14.
- 126 Seneca, *Contr.*, 1, 1, 32.
- 127 Philostratus, *V.S.*, 2, 7, 577.
- 128 Seneca, *Contr.*, 2, 2, 9–11. Cf. *JR* 320 n. 114.
- 129 Gellius, 9, 15.
- 130 Cf. *JR* 322–38.
- 131 Cf. *JR* 322–30.
- 132 Horace, *A.P.*, 114–16.
- 133 Quintilian, 11, 1, 31–2 (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 134 Quintilian, 2, 4, 3–8 (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 135 Cicero, *De or.*, 2, 21, 88–9 (transl. E.W.Sutton/H.Rackham). In similar words Cicero speaks elsewhere (cf. pp. 18–19) of the evolution of youthful character.
- 136 Cicero, *Brut.*, 95, 325–6 (transl. G.L.Hendrickson).
- 137 Cicero, *Brut.*, 91, 313; 91, 316 (transl. G.L.Hendrickson).
- 138 Quintilian, 12, 10, 12 (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 139 Thus G.Kennedy (1972) 241ff.
- 140 A.D.Leeman (1963) 144–5.
- 141 Cicero, *Or.*, 9, 30.
- 142 Cf. A.D.Leeman (1963) 159: ‘a *novum genus* of youngsters’.
- 143 Cf. A.D.Leeman (1963) 160.
- 144 Cf. pp. 169ff.
- 145 Cf. the enthusiastic reaction of his bosom friend Catullus in c. 53. On Calvus, cf. A.D.Leeman (1963) 151: ‘We can easily imagine that Calvus’ violent delivery and vibrating style could make Cicero’s

elaborate pathos look a little cheap in the eyes of his young contemporaries.'

- 146 For an example from late antiquity, cf. Jerome, *Ep.*, 52, 1: 'When I was a young man, scarcely more than a boy (*adulescens, immo paene puer*), and was trying to curb the first tides of youthful wantonness (*impetus lascivientis aetatis*), I wrote a letter.... In that production I indulged my youthful fancy (*pro aetate tunc lusimus*), and being still fired with enthusiasm for the teaching of the rhetoricians, I decked out some parts of it with the flowering language of the schools. Today, however, my hair is grey' (transl. F.A.Wright).
- 147 Cf. Seneca, *Contr.*, 7 Pr. 6: 'A tender age normally shuns everything that resembles vulgarity, let alone vulgarity itself' (transl. M.Winterbottom).
- 148 Quintilian, 2, 5, 22 (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 149 Quintilian, 10, 1, 125ff. Cf. p. 109.
- 150 Cf. *JR* 330–8.
- 151 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De comp. verb.*, 1, 4–5.
- 152 Cf. pp. 164–5.
- 153 Augustine, *Conf.*, 3, 5, 9 (transl. H.Chadwick). For a similar experience on the part of young Jerome, cf. Jerome, *Ep.*, 22, 30.
- 154 Quintilian, 5, 12, 18 (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 155 Cf. *JR* 322–34.
- 156 Seneca, *Contr.*, 7, 3, 8.
- 157 Tacitus, *D.*, 20, 4 (transl. W.Peterson).
- 158 Cf. *JR* 334–6.
- 159 Quintilian, 10, 1, 7; 8 Pr. 27.
- 160 Cicero, *De or.*, 3, 13, 51.
- 161 Gellius, 1, 10 (transl. J.C.Rolfe).
- 162 For a similar phenomenon in poetry, cf. pp. 193ff.
- 163 Seneca, *Suas.*, 2, 10 (transl. M.Winterbottom).
- 164 Seneca, *Contr.*, 1 Pr. 8 (transl. M.Winterbottom). Cf. pp. 98–9.
- 165 Pliny, *Ep.*, 2, 14, 12–13 (transl. B.Radice).
- 166 Cf. *JR* 339–67.
- 167 Cf. H.von Arnim (1898) 1–114.
- 168 Cf. *JR* 340–3.
- 169 Cf. Plato, *Gorg.*, 484C
- 170 Ennius, in Cicero, *Tusc.*, 2, 1, 1.
- 171 Seneca, *Ep.*, 36, 1ff.
- 172 Epictetus, *Diss.*, 1, 26, 5–7.
- 173 Tacitus, *Agr.*, 4, 5–6.
- 174 Quintilian, 12, 3, 11–12 (transl. H.E.Butler). Cf. Fronto, *De eloquentia*, 3, 4; 4, 3 (cf. pp. 148–9).
- 175 Plutarch, *Cato Mai.*, 22, 2–5 (transl. B. Perrin).
- 176 Cf. L.Friedländer (1923) III, 253ff.

- 177 Cf. *JR* 343–9.
- 178 Cf. pp. 20–1.
- 179 Plutarch, *Aud.*, 4ff. Other relevant texts are e.g. Gellius, 1, 9, 8–10; 7, 10, 5; Epictetus, *Diss.*, 2, 16, 20; 3, 24, 78.
- 180 Cf. *JR* 349–55, and A.-J.Festugière (1977) 157ff. Cf. A.D.Nock (1939) 165–77, with whom, however, I cannot always agree. The reader may judge whether or not the examples I give are proof enough of the fact that such ‘conversions’ were typical for adolescence.
- 181 E.g. Valerius Maximus, 6, 9 ext. 1 (on Polemo, a dissolute young man who was converted after hearing a speech by the academic Xenocrates, whose successor he became); Diogenes Laertius, 6, 7, 96–7 (on the girl Hipparchia who fell in love with the Cynic philosopher Crates). Cf. *JR* 349–50.
- 182 Cicero, *Brut.*, 89, 306.
- 183 *Appendix Vergiliana*, *Cat.*, 5.
- 184 Persius, 5, 21ff. Cf. p. 20.
- 185 Seneca, *Ep.*, 108, 3–4; 13–14 (transl. R.M.Gummere).
- 186 E.g. Apollonius of Tyana (Philostratus, *V. Apol.*, 1, 7), Marcus Aurelius (*Augustan History*, *Aur. M.*, 2, 6; cf. *JR* 352–3) and Augustine’s pupil Licentius (Augustine, *Ord.*, 1, 3, 8 PL 32, 982; 1, 8, 21 PL 32, 987; cf. *JR* 354–5).
- 187 Augustine, *Conf.*, 3, 4, 7–8 (transl. H.Chadwick). On Augustine’s first conversion, cf. M.Peters (1921) 195ff.; P.Courcelle (1968) 56ff.; J.J.O’Meara (1954) 56ff.; E.Eyben (1971) 92ff.
- 188 Cf. *JR* 355–67.
- 189 Cf. *JR* 355–7.
- 190 Plutarch, *Aud.*, 7, 41BD. Cf. *ibid.*, 9, 42E.
- 191 Seneca, *Ep.*, 108, 7 and 11–12 (transl. R.M.Gummere).
- 192 Seneca, *Ep.*, 20, 2.
- 193 Cf. *JR* 357–61.
- 194 Plutarch, *Prof. virt.*, 7, 78EF.
- 195 Gellius, 1, 2. Cf. Epictetus, *Diss.*, 2, 19, 12ff.
- 196 Augustine, *Conf.*, 3, 4, 8; 3, 5, 9. Cf. pp. 156–7.
- 197 Cf. P.Alfaric (1918) *passim*; J.J.O’Meara (1954) 61ff.; P.Courcelle (1968) 60ff.; L.C.Ferrari (1975) 210–16; L.E.Feldman (1976) *passim*; *idem* (1980) 198–216.
- 198 Augustine, *Util. cr.*, 1, 2 PL 42, 66.
- 199 Augustine, *Util. cr.*, 1, 2 (transl. C.L.Cornish).
- 200 Augustine, *Duab. an.*, 9, 11 PL 42, 102 (transl. D.Newman).
- 201 Augustine, *Conf.*, 6, 10, 17 (transl. W.Watts).
- 202 Augustine, *Ep.*, 98, 8 PL 33, 363.
- 203 Cf. *JR* 363–4.
- 204 *Augustan History*, *Aur. M.*, 2, 6.

- 205 Philostratus, *V. Apoll.*, 1, 8 and 13.
- 206 Has this observation to do with the awakening of logical thinking at puberty, as discussed on p. 11?
- 207 Seneca, *Ep.*, 108, 17ff.; 13ff.; 12; 23 (transl. R.M. Gummere).
- 208 Lucian, *Nigr.*, 27–8.
- 209 Epictetus, *Diss.*, 4, 8, 34; 4, 11, 25ff.; *Ench.*, 47; 33, 8. On Epictetus' educational system in general, cf. J.Souilhé (1943) I, xxxff.; B.L. Hijmans (1959).
- 210 Cf. *JR* 541–67, esp. 549–55. In this book I do not deal with state religion, which seems to have had little impact on young people, or with Christianity, on which I hope to write a separate study.
- 211 Cf. e.g. J.Souilhé (1943) I, lviii ff.
- 212 Lucian, *Hermot.*, 81.
- 213 Epictetus, *Diss.*, 1, 9, 12–18.
- 214 Valerius Maximus, 8, 9 ext. 3; Cicero, *Tusc.*, 1, 34, 83; Diogenes Laertius, 2, 86.
- 215 Cf. e.g. J.Geffcken (1929).
- 216 Iamblichus, *V.Pyth.*, 18, 80ff.; 21, 95ff.
- 217 Iamblichus, *V.Pyth.*, 5, 21ff.; 8, 37; 17, 71; 32, 201.
- 218 Livy, 1, 18, 2.
- 219 Philostratus, *V.Apoll.*, 1, 7; 4, 17; 8, 21.
- 220 Philostratus, *V.Apoll.*, 8, 31.
- 221 Cf. e.g. J.Geffcken (1929) 103ff.; F.Cumont (1949) 372ff.
- 222 Eunapius, 457ff. On Iamblichus' school, cf. J.Bidez (1919) 29–40.
- 223 Libanius, *Or.*, 18, 18; Eunapius, 473ff.; Julian, *Heracl.*, 235AB. Julian's religious experiences during his youth are described in terms of a typical pubertal crisis in A.-J.Festugière (1957) 53–8; (1959) 67ff. Cf. J.Bidez (1921) 197–216; F.Schemmel (1927c) 455–66.
- 224 Apuleius, *Apol.*, 55, 8–9.
- 225 For youthful interest in magic, cf. *JR* 560–7.
- 226 Apuleius, *Met.*, 11, 23, 7 and *passim* (transl. W. Adlington).
- 227 Cf. *JR* 368–459.
- 228 Cf. *JR* 368–80.
- 229 Cf. pp. 157, 167–8.
- 230 Seneca, *Ep.*, 108, 10 (transl. R.M. Gummere).
- 231 For the moral dangers of poetry, cf. *JR* 84 n. 89.
- 232 Quintilian, 1, 8, 6–7.
- 233 Plutarch, *Aud. poet.*, *passim*. For Plutarch's educational views, cf. D. Faure (1960).
- 234 Plutarch, *Aem.*, 28, 6; Polybius, 31, 23, 4. For Scipio's relationship with his 'ideal' Polybius, cf. pp. 229ff.
- 235 Cf. p. 143.
- 236 Ovid, *Trist.*, 4, 10, 41–2 (transl. A.L.Wheeler).
- 237 Fronto, *Ad M. Caes.*, 2, 10, 2.

- 238 Basil the Great's tract *Ad adolescentes, quomodo possint ex gentiliu libris fructum capere* deals with the way young Christians could use profane literature. Cf. M.Naldini (1978) 36–44.
- 239 John Cassian, *Conl.*, 14, 12–13.
- 240 Jerome, *Ep.*, 22, 30. This dream has been frequently discussed: cf. e.g. P. Monceaux (1932) 119ff.; P.Antin (1963) 350–77; A.M.Fiske (1965) 119–38.
- 241 But not in the second century AD, the period of archaism: cf. pp. 157–8.
- 242 Horace, *Ep.*, 2, 1, 76ff. (transl. H.R.Fairclough).
- 243 Cicero, *Tusc.*, 3, 19, 45.
- 244 Catullus, 5, 2. Cf. Propertius, 2, 30, 1: *senes duri*.
- 245 Ovid *Am.*, 2, 1, 5ff. (transl. J.H.Mozley).
- 246 Cf. *JR* 378–80.
- 247 This is the reason why poetry played such an important role in the education of the future orator or rhetorician. Cf. *JR* 369 n. 6.
- 248 As is evident in the case of young Augustine: cf. pp. 134–5.
- 249 Julian, *Euseb.*, 15, 123D–124D (transl. W.C.Wright).
- 250 Cf. the almost physical aversion Catullus displays for bad poetry in e.g. *carmen* 36, 18–20.
- 251 Augustine, *Conf.*, 3, 2, 2–4 (transl. H.Chadwick).
- 252 Cf. A.P.Dorjahn (1949–50) 391–2, and *JR* 380–402, where many other poets are considered and where the chronology of their life and work is discussed. In many cases it is difficult to say anything with certainty. For Catullus I proposed 77–47BC as dates of birth and death (cf. *JR* 385–7; P.Gilbert and M.Renard (1942) 93–6), a proposal which is endorsed by A.W.J.Holleman in *RBPhH* 59 (1981) 163.
- 253 Horace, *Ep.*, 2, 1, 108–10 (transl. H.R.Fairclough).
- 254 Horace, *A.P.*, 295ff. (transl. H.R.Fairclough).
- 255 M.Schanz/C.Hosius (1959) I, 285 ('eine Gesellschaft meist jugendlicher Hitzköpfe').
- 256 Cf. *JR* 381–3. According to J.Christes (1971) 12–17, Lucilius started his career as a poet at about 15. But see W.A.Krenkel (1972) 1240ff. for whom Lucilius was born in 180BC and made his début at about 50.
- 257 Catullus, 68, 15–18 (transl. F.W.Cornish).
- 258 Propertius, 4, 1, 131–4 (transl. G.P.Goold).
- 259 Ovid, *Trist.*, 4, 10, 1ff.
- 260 Cf. p. 177.
- 261 Augustine, *Ord.*, 1, 2ff. PL 32, 980ff. On Augustine as an educator, cf. F.X.Eggersdsorfer (1907) 73ff.; G.Howie (1969). On Licentius, cf. Levy (1926) 204–10; D. Romano (1961) 1–22; G.Bardy (1954) 55–79.
- 262 Cf. *JR* 405–59.

- 263 Cf. *JR* 407–35.
- 264 Cf. *JR* 407–11. Cf. e.g. A.W.Allen (1950) 145–60; U.Knoche (1975) 133–49; N.Rudd (1964) 216–31; G.Williams (1970) 106ff.; J.Griffin (1976) 87–105; *idem* (1981) 39–49; M.L.Clarke (1976) 132–9.
- 265 Cf. e.g. A.W.Allen (1950) 145–60; F.Cairns (1979); P.Veyne (1983). According to A.W.Allen, the question we should ask is not ‘Did the elegist really feel this?’, but rather ‘Is it reasonable that the lover whose character appears in the elegies should speak in this manner?’ (p. 153). For F.Cairns, ‘the whole of classical poetry is written in accordance with the sets of rules of the various genres’ (p. 31); ‘a writer working in accordance with genre patterns... cannot, for instance, draw his inspiration directly from individual incidences and experiences in his own life’ (p. 90). In Veyne’s view, love is not a psychic constant but a cultural creation; the elegists laugh at what they describe—at the tempestuous love-affair, the supercilious heroine, and the subservient ego.
- 266 N.Rudd (1964) 220, 221. Cf. J.Griffin (1976) 88: ‘not only does literature reflect, at whatever remove and with whatever stylization, the experiences of life, but also in its turn it affects actual behaviour; and can do so with great force’; *idem* (1981) 39: ‘Poetry, although it is not just the same thing as life, is not totally remote from it either; not only is poetry influenced by history, but human behaviour in turn is influenced by poetry.’
- 267 Cf. J.P.Hallett (1973) 122 n. 25: ‘Latin love poetry also must have purposely contained enough general social realism to strike a chord of recognition in readers’ hearts; i.e. the Roman literary public must have known other men who acted as Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid claimed to behave.’
- 268 C.P.Segal (1968) 284–5.
- 269 Cf. *JR* 411–24. The reader will understand that it is not possible to remind him or her constantly of the possible difference between the poetical *persona* and the poet as a historical person.
- 270 Cf. H.Haffter (1967) *passim*; B.-A.Taladoire (1972) *passim*; L.Perelli (1976) *passim*.
- 271 Lucilius’ poetry too was very personal. However, we are not certain about his youthful age. Cf. n. 256.
- 272 Cf. *JR* 411ff., and e.g. V.Sirago (1947); J.Granarolo (1967); K.Quinn (1969); H.Bardon (1970); F.Stoessl (1977); R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 19–61; E.Adler (1981); J.Granarolo (1982); T.P. Wiseman (1985); J.Ferguson (1988).
- 273 Thus U.Knoche (1958) 149. Cf. J.Ferguson (1988) 1, for whom the following judgement of R.G.L.Levens is ‘a shade too facile’: ‘The present age is all the more at home with Catullus because the feelings he expressed were those of an individualist clinging, in a

- disintegrating society, to the one standard which he could feel was secure, that of personal integrity'. Even those scholars who make a strict distinction between a poet's life and his work are inclined to make an exception for Catullus. Cf. M. Wyke (1989) 168: 'Veyne admits, however, that the Catullan poetic self does not appear to fit easily into his broad scheme. Nisbet is not the only critic who has felt that whatever theory challenges the "sincerity" of Augustan elegy's confessions, the Catullan corpus remains unshaken in the direct explorations of a poet's personal experience.'
- 274 Catullus, 1, 4 (*nugae*); 50, 2 and 5; 68, 17 (*ludere*).
- 275 H.A.Khan (1968) 4. Cf. J.Ferguson (1988) 1-2.
- 276 Cf. E.A.Havelock (1939) 78: 'Even in his longer compositions, his writing becomes significant and important only in so far as it is lyrical. He is *par excellence* the poet of intense moods expressed either singly or in rapid succession.'
- 277 J.Granarolo (1982) 126.
- 278 H.Bardon (1970) 96ff. (Berenice), 97ff. (Laodamia); T.Oksala (1962) 199-213; J.Ferguson (1988) 34 (Attis); F.Klingner (1965a) 218-38, esp. 228-9, 231-2; M.L.Daniels (1967) 351-6 (Peles and Thetis). Cf. the studies mentioned in *JR* 413-4 nn. 244-51 and B. Arkins (1982) 116-56; T.P.Wiseman (1985) 175-82.
- 279 H.Bardon (1970) 28ff. and *passim*.
- 280 F.Stoessl (1969) 152.
- 281 Cf. *JR* 415-20, with bibliography.
- 282 Cf. e.g. G.Luck (1969) 12, 20, 25ff.
- 283 Cf. J.-P.Boucher (1965); G.Luck (1969) 118ff.; A.De Sanctis (1973); A.La Penna (1977); R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 82-148; H.-P.Stahl (1985); N.Holzberg (1990) 27-60.
- 284 G.Luck (1969) 144.
- 285 E.Reitzenstein (1936) *passim*.
- 286 Cf. P.Boyancé (1956) 169-220, *passim*; J.-P.Boucher (1965) 227ff.; G.Lieberg (1969) 311-47; R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 81ff.
- 287 Cf. M.Schuster (1968); J.P.Elder (1965) 65-105; W.Wimmel (1968); G.Luck (1969) 70-82; F.Cairns (1979); R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 149-89; N.Holzberg (1990) 61-86.
- 288 J.P.Elder (1965) 68.
- 289 G.Luck (1969) 84.
- 290 Cf. M.Schuster (1930) 2 and *passim*.
- 291 J.P.Elder (1965) 65-101. Cf. G.Luck (1969) 14.
- 292 W.Wimmel (1968) 19 ('Vermeidungskunst'). According to F.Cairns (1979), Tibullus is not at all an uncomplicated poet. He too is a *poeta doctus* whose art consisted in concealing art (*ars est celare artem*).

- 293 Cf. H.de la Ville de Mirmont (1905); G.Luck (1969) 149–80; H.Fränkcl (1970); A.F.Sabot (1976); N.Scivoletto (1976); R.O.A. M.Lyne (1980) 239–87; N.Holzberg (1990) 87–119.
- 294 L.P.Wilkinson (1974) 225–6. Cf. G.Luck (1969) 155: ‘[Corinna] is a composite character, a name he uses to represent the various women he has known in his youth.’
- 295 Cf. *JR* 419 with n. 293.
- 296 Cf. esp. H.Fränkcl (1979) *passim*. This scholar sees Ovid as an *anima naturaliter christiana*, a poet between two worlds, between paganism and Christianity. Cf. G.Luck (1969) 161: ‘Ovid’s art is by no means all play and frivolity. At times, there is a deep seriousness under the smiling mask’; E.J.Kenney (1970) 765: ‘It is, however, a mistake to label Ovid an unreflecting hedonist. Other poets surpass him in profundity, but his catholic sensibility has no parallel in the literature of the ancient world.’
- 297 Cf. J.P.Hallett (1973) 14, who refers to Ovid, *Am.*, 1, 10, 29–36; *Ars.*, 2, 682; 2, 727–8 and continues: ‘in fact, he rejects homosexual practices [*Ars.*, 2, 682–4] for their “undemocratic” nature, in that both parties are not equally gratified by lovemaking’. Cf. G.Luck (1969) 175, 177.
- 298 Thus e.g. R.P.Oliver (1945) 191–215; S.Lilja (1978) 15.
- 299 Cf. E.Reitzenstein (1968) 206–32.
- 300 K.Vretska (1967) 347.
- 301 Cf. Virgil, *G.*, 4, 565: *carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa*.
- 302 Cf. J.Hubaux (1930) 217, who refers to Gallus’ last words (*B.*, 10, 69): *omnia vincit amor et nos cedamus amori*; F.Klingner (1965) 265, who stresses the difference to the *Aeneid*, where love appears as a perturbing factor.
- 303 Cf. W.Schadewaldt (1966) 43–68, esp. 54; V.Pöschl (1964) 87; B.Snell (1955) 392: ‘Later Virgil himself undoubtedly experienced it as morbid to cling to these expressions of the soul, but...the inclusive-loving, the sensitive-suffering, point to the distant future [of the West]’ (my transl.).
- 304 Cf. especially F.Klingner (1965c) 353ff., 364.
- 305 Cf. pp. 193–4, 195–6.
- 306 Thus W.Rutz in *Gnomon* 37 (1955) 61; O.Schönberger (1970) 534.
- 307 Cf. A.Thierfelder (1970) 50–69; K.Seitz (1965) 204–32, esp. 214; M.von Albrecht (1968) 269–308, esp. 292; W.Rutz (1970) 1–9.
- 308 Cf. *JR* 424–30.
- 309 Whereas epic poetry is the domain of old age. Cf. e.g. Propertius, 2, 10, 7–8, and pp. 191–3.
- 310 Cf. pp. 247ff. (love), 215ff. (friendship).

- 311 For youthful age as a stimulus to write aggressive poetry, cf. Plutarch, *Cato Min.*, 7, 2; Horace, *C.*, 1, 16, 22–6; Claudian, *Carm. min.*, 22, 6.
- 312 Cf. *JR* 425.
- 313 Cf. p. 204.
- 314 On Cicero, cf. e.g. O. Weinreich (1975) 18ff.; E. Laughton (1970) 1–7; C. Deroux (1985b) 221–46. As J. Ferguson (1988) 30 writes, ‘it is hard to see how readers (e.g. T. Frank (1919) 409–11) have failed to detect the irony which underlies the address to Cicero (c. 49)’. On Caesar, cf. J. Granarolo (1958) 53–73; C. Deroux (1970) 608–31. Cf. also A. D. Leeman (1963–4) 109–11.
- 315 Cf. A. D. Leeman (1963–4) 101–14. Cf. V. Broege (1976) 171, 172: ‘Catullus was alienated from the traditional pursuits and goals of the typical Roman citizen of his time.... Catullus’ rebellious life style was probably due equally to his temperament and his youth.’
- 316 J.-P. Cèbe (1965) 221–9 characterizes Catullus and his friends in the following way: ‘A youthful student-like spirit, refusal to conform and to submit to outdated customs, a taste for humour, ardent passions with no tolerance for compromise, a tendency to throw himself against the establishment, a desire to scandalize the “bourgeois” with dirty talk and by riding roughshod over the conventions’ (my transl.). Cf. A. D. Leeman (1963–4) 101–14; J. Granarolo (1967) 160ff.; *idem* (1968) 597–610; *idem* (1982) 102ff.; T. Reekmans (1973) 159–66.
- 317 E.g. M. Morford (1984) 25ff. Cf. C. S. Dessen (1968a), who calls Persius an ‘angry young poet’, ‘a rebellious young writer, critical of the poetic establishment’ (p. 38).
- 318 P. Y. Forsyth (1976) 211–20, esp. 211. Cf. J. M. K. Martin (1939) 172–82; W. S. Anderson (1982) 169–93; M. Morford (1984) *passim*.
- 319 Cf. *JR* 430–5.
- 320 Cf. *JR* 433–4.
- 321 Horace, *Ep.*, 2, 2, 55–7; 141–4 (transl. H. R. Fairclough). Cf. *JR* 434–5.
- 322 Cf. *JR* 430–3, and W. Steidle (1962) 100–40; J.-P. Boucher (1965) 188ff.; J. H. Brouwers (1967) 34ff.; H.-P. Stahl (1985) 137ff. (‘No Epic for the Master of Rome’) and *passim*.
- 323 Propertius, 2, 10, 1–8 (transl. G. P. Goold).
- 324 Even in this book, however, he did not forget his Delia: cf. e.g. M. Komp (1988) (on 4, 7 and 4, 8).
- 325 J.-P. Boucher (1965) 158 (my transl.).
- 326 Cf. *JR* 435–41. This part deals with youthful poetry which is often enigmatic. Let us also mention the fact that, as graffiti from Pompeii show, a *real* secret language was not unknown to the Ancients. Thus we find inscriptions such as *Sullimah Ehton sic amo* (instead of

- Hamillus Nothe sic amo*), s. *vIvrvC. oLimia SaL* (instead of *Curvius Aemilio salutem*), *anumrub* (instead of *urbanum*) (*CIL*, IV, 3711; 2400E; 5086). It can only have been teenagers who scratched such sentences on the walls to express themselves in a secret way. Cf. H.H.Tanzer (1939) 88–9.
- 327 J.Huizinga (1980) 131.
- 328 References in *JR* 436 n. 388. Cf. H.Wagenvoort (1956) 30–42.
- 329 Catullus, 95; Quintilian, 10, 4, 4; Servius, *Ecl.*, 9, 35.
- 330 J.-P.Boucher (1965) 438ff.
- 331 L.A.Mackay (1970) 177–83, esp. 177–8.
- 332 W.Berg (1974) 106–7. Cf. *ibid.*, 144ff. ('On Obscurity').
- 333 Cf. e.g. J.M.K.Martin (1939) 172–82; U.Knoche (1971) 82ff.; R.G. M.Nisbet (1963) 39–71; C.S.Dessen (1968a) *passim*; W.S.Anderson (1982) 169ff.; M.Morford (1984) 73ff.
- 334 M.Morford (1984) I. Cf. *ibid.*, 95: 'Persius had suffered from the same uncomprehending criticism as many "obscure" modern poets'.
- 335 Quintilian, 8, 2, 18.
- 336 Cf. *JR* 441–59.
- 337 Cf. e.g. Horace, *S.*, 1, 10, 31–5 (on his début in Greek); 1, 10, 36–48 (on his *Satires*); *Ep.*, 1, 1, 23–5 (on his *Epodes*); Propertius, 3, 2, 25–6; Catullus, 1, 10; Ovid, *Am.*, 1, 15, 7–8; Lucan, 9, 980–6.
- 338 Cf. *JR* 444–59.
- 339 J.Bayet (1965) 331–2 (my transl.). Cf. J.M.K.Martin (1939) 182. 'a Stoic evangelist'.
- 340 Cf. p. 163.
- 341 J.W.Duff (1936) 124.
- 342 P.Y.Forsyth (1976) 220.
- 343 W.Rutz, in *Gnomon* (1965) 60 ('littérature engagée').
- 344 W.Pfligersdorfer (1959) 344–77 ('der Dichter des geistigen Widerstandes').
- 345 T.Roszak, quoted in J.P.Hallett (1973) 108.
- 346 Cicero, *Sest.*, 23, 51; 65, 136–9.
- 347 Cf. pp. 60ff.
- 348 J.-P.Boucher (1965) 24 (concerning Propertius), who also speaks of the 'values of contradiction' ('valeurs de contradiction') of the elegiac poets.
- 349 Cf. G.Williams (1970) 9–10: 'Catullus was totally uninterested in politics, except as a subject for invective.'
- 350 Propertius, 4, 1, 131–4. Cf. *ibid.*, 1, 6, 29–30: 'I was born unfit for glory, unfit for arms: love is the warfare fate wishes me to undergo' (transl. G.P.Goold). Cf. *JR* 449–51, and W.Steidle (1962) 100–40; A.La Penna (1977) *passim*; H.-P.Stahl (1985) *passim*.
- 351 Cf. *JR* 451–3, with literature.

- 352 Cf. Catullus, 5, 1–3; Propertius, 2, 30, 13–14; Tibullus, 2, 3, 31–2; Ovid, *Am.*, 2, 1, 3.
- 353 Cf. *jR* 452–3, with literature.
- 354 Cf. *jR* 453–6, with literature.
- 355 Cf. F.Klingner (1965b) 179 (‘ein unerhörtes Seelanabenteuer’).
- 356 Propertius, 2, 7A, 19–20 (transl. G.P.Goold).
- 357 Catullus, 109,6 (transl. F.W.Cornish). Cf. P.McGushin (1967) 85–93.
- 358 E.Burck (1966) 193ff. (my transl.). For the view of Catullus and the elegiac poets on love, cf. pp. 247ff. *passim*.
- 359 U.Knoche (1958) 153 (my transl.). Cf. F.Klingner (1965b) 179–80, who makes the link with the *Eclogues* of the youthful Virgil: ‘Virgil’s Arcadia, too, is ultimately nothing else: a land of dreams and of the soul, at one with the artificial world of bucolic, longed-for homeland, attainable in the chant of the poet who, homeless in the soulless, terrible, brutal reality of everyday life, finds there what he seeks here in vain’ (my transl.).
- 360 J.Granarolo (1967) 108, 157ff., 381. Concerning Persius, cf. e.g. P.Y.Forsyth (1976) 211–20.
- 361 A.D.Leeman (1963–4) 101–14.
- 362 Cf. H.Bardon (1970) 88, 104; R. Whitacker (1983) 11 and *passim*. Further references are in *jR* 456.
- 363 Cf. *jR* 456–9, and K.J.Pratt (1955–6) 21–5; D.N.Levin (1982) 418–538.
- 364 Tibullus, 1, 1, 75–8 (transl. J.B.Postgate). Cf. *jR* 457.
- 365 Propertius, 3, 5, 1 (transl. G.P.Goold).
- 366 Propertius, 2, 15, 41–6; 2, 7, 13–18 (transl. G.P.Goold). Cf. *jR* 457, and L. Alfonsi (1945) 61–8.
- 367 Cf. *jR* 458–9.
- 368 Cf. especially Tibullus, 1, 1. Cf. *jR* 458, with literature, e.g. J.P. Elder (1965) 81, who speaks of ‘a dreamlike world of escape’.
- 369 Horace, *Epod.*, 16, 1ff. (transl. H.E.Butler). Cf. *jR* 458–9, with literature, e.g. F.Klingner (1965c) 353ff.; D.Ableitinger-Grünberger (1971); P.Senay (1982) 153–7; R.Syme (1966) 218.
- 370 Virgil, *B.*, 4, 8ff. (transl. H.R.Fairclough). Cf. *jR* 459, with literature, e.g. R.Syme (1966) 218–19; B.Snell (1938) 237–42; F.Klingner (1967) 14.

V THE EMOTIONAL LIFE OF THE YOUNG ROMAN

- 1 Cicero, *Off.*, 1, 34, 122.
- 2 Gellius, 2, 15, 1–2. The author continues: ‘From a dinner-party, too, older men were escorted home by younger men, as we read in the records of the past, a custom which, as tradition has it, the Romans

- took over from the Lacedaemonians, by whom, in accordance with the laws of Lycurgus, greater honour on all occasion was paid to greater age' (transl. J.C.Rolfe).
- 3 Cf. pp. 222ff.
 - 4 Cf. p. 38.
 - 5 Plin., *Ep.* 8, 23, 2–3 (transl. B.Radice).
 - 6 Cf. pp. 47ff. (in the army), 65ff. (in politics).
 - 7 Seneca, *Ir.*, 3, 25, 2 (transl. J.W.Basore).
 - 8 Ps.-Seneca, *Oct.*, 446–7.
 - 9 But this was only permitted in the case of children, not of young men. Cf. Quintilian, 1, 3, 14–17.
 - 10 Juvenal, 7, 213–14.
 - 11 Ausonius, *Ep.*, 22, 73ff. (transl. H.G.E.White).
 - 12 Cicero, *Cael.*, 8, 9.
 - 13 Cicero, *Fam.*, 8, 13, 2. Cf. J.-P.Morel (1976) 666.
 - 14 Catullus, 28, 15; 29, 5; 49, 1 (*Romuli nepotes*); 5, 2 (*senes severiores*). Cf. Propertius, 2, 30, 1 (*senes duri*).
 - 15 Seneca, *Contr.*, 4, 1. Mourning manifested itself in long hair and dark clothes. Hence the haircut and the change. Cf. M. Winterbottom *ad locum*.
 - 16 Seneca, *Ir.*, 3, 38, 1.
 - 17 Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 14, 10C.
 - 18 Cf. Juvenal, 13, 53–9: 'Dishonesty was a prodigy in those days; when men deemed it a heinous sin, worthy of death, if a youth did not rise before his elders, or a boy before any bearded man.... So worshipful was it to be older by four years, so equal to reverend age was the first down of manhood!' (transl. G.G.Ramsay).
 - 19 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 3, 31, 4–7.
 - 20 Juvenal, 3, 278ff. (cf. pp. 108–9).
 - 21 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 10, 7, 3 (transl. E.Spelmann; cf. p. 107).
 - 22 Phaedrus, 115, 1ff.
 - 23 Gellius, 10, 3, 5.
 - 24 For reference to the primary sources and discussion, cf. *jR* 240–1 n. 101; A.Otto (1962) s.v. *sexagenarios de ponte*; T.Birt (1926) 115–26; B.Baldwin (1976) 222–3; J.-P.Néraudau (1979) 318–22; *idem* (1978) 159–74. According to Néraudau, the proverb is a rather recent creation by the comic Afranius (c. 120–100Bc).
 - 25 Cf. L.Robinson (1976) 477–83.
 - 26 Cf. *jR* 526–40. Cf. J.W.Hewitt (1931) 30–48; A.Lumpe/H.Karpp (1959) 1191–1219; H.W.Rissom (1971); A.Wlosok (1978) 18–54; G.R.Lambert (1982); E.Eyben (1991) 114–43.
 - 27 References are in *jR* 528 n. 18.
 - 28 Cicero, *Off.*, 1, 45, 160.

- 29 Epictetus, *Diss.*, 2, 10, 7 (transl. W.A.Oldfather).
- 30 References are in *JR* 529 nn. 20–5.
- 31 Cf. E.Eyben (1991) 114–16, with bibliography, e.g. E.Sachers (1953) 1046–1175; J.Crook (1967) 113–22; W.K.Lacey (1986) 121–44; R.P. Saller (1986) 7–22; (1988) 393–410.
- 32 Gaius, 1, 55. Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*, 2, 26, 1ff. Especially a father's right to sell his child (and enrich himself in this way) seemed 'harsh and tyrannical' to Dionysius and to anyone who was educated 'in the lax manners of the Greeks'.
- 33 Examples of fathers who kill their *adult* sons are rare and mostly legendary; in most of the examples we know state interest is involved. As one can understand, such 'heroic cruelty' sharpened the tension between the generations, as is related explicitly in the case of Manlius Torquatus: 'When Titus Manlius returned to Rome, it is said that on his approach only the seniors went out to meet him, and that the young men, then and for all the remainder of his days, abhorred and execrated him' (Livy, 8, 12, 1, transl. B.O. Foster). In a recent article, W.V. Harris (1985) 81–95, investigates the *vitalis necisque potestas* and stresses the real rarity of historical instances in which it was implemented with regard to adult sons. In his eyes, this right in later times (after the period of Augustus?) only provided cover for child exposure.
- 34 R.P. Saller (1986) 7–22, esp. 20. Cf. W.V.Harris (1985) 81–95.
- 35 *Digest.*, 47, 9, 5. Cf. M.Roberti (1935) 257–70; R.P.Saller (1988) 393ff., who clearly demonstrates that 'the stereotype of the Roman father as an authoritarian figure wielding vast and oppressive disciplinary powers over his children is misleadingly simplistic.... The cardinal virtue of the family, *pietas*, can not be translated as "obedience". It was something due by all members of the family to all others' (p. 410).
- 36 Cf. E.Eyben (1991) 121ff.
- 37 Cicero, *Rep.*, 1, 43, 67, who endorses the views of Plato, *Rep.*, 8, 562E–563B. Cf. p. 24.
- 38 Livy, 26, 22, 15.
- 39 Seneca, *Ben.*, 5, 17, 4 (transl. J.W.Basore). Cf. E.Eyben (1977) 529–30.
- 40 In a way, one can say that the Romans institutionalized the generation gap by the *patria potestas*. But P.Veyne (1978) 36 is doubtless wrong when he emphasizes the lack of affection in the Roman family and the 'surprising frequency' of parricide. Cf. D.Daube (1969) 88: 'Sons wished their fathers dead, and more and more frequently the wish was father to the deed.' R.P.Saller (1986) 7–22, esp. 9; *idem* (1987) 21–2 strongly—and convincingly—opposes such opinions.

- 41 Velleius Paterculus, 2, 67, 2.
- 42 Seneca, *Clem.*, 3, 21, 1; 3, 13, 3–7. Cf. *JR* 529–30.
- 43 Cf. Seneca, *Ben.*, 3, 37, 1–4 (Aeneas); Livy, 7, 4–5 (Titus Manlius). Cf. *JR* 537 n. 64.
- 44 Cf. J.W.Hewitt (1931) 30–48.
- 45 *Augustan History*, *Aur. M.*, 7, 2–3 (transl. D.Magie).
- 46 Horace, *S.*, 1, 6, 89–97 (transl. H.R.Fairclough). For the relationship between Horace and his father, cf. E.L.Harrison (1965) 111–14; E.W.Leach (1971) 616–32; G.Highet (1973) 268–81.
- 47 Plutarch, *Am. prolis*, 4, 497A.
- 48 Seneca, *Ben.*, 5, 5, 2 (transl. J.W.Basore). In one of his letters Seneca (Ep., 99, 12) is even of the opinion that there is no reason to mourn the loss of a child: ‘This little boy has lost nothing except a hazard where loss was more assured than gain (*aleam in damnum certioorem*). He might have turned out temperate and prudent; he might, with your fostering care, have been moulded to a better standard; but (and this fear is more reasonable) he might have become just like the many’ (transl. J.W.Basore).
- 49 Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 17, 12Fff. (transl. F.C.Babbitt).
- 50 Cf. Strabo, 19, 2: ‘It is somehow a characteristic of old age to oppose the young in most things, and especially is it insensible to the desires of lovers’ (transl. H.L.Jones). Other references are in *JR* 532 nn. 38ff.
- 51 Cf. P.-E Legrand (1910) 174ff.; E.Segal (1976) 135–42; H.-W. Rissom (1971), esp. 161ff.; M.Casali (1973); D.Bo (1976).
- 52 Terence, *Heaut.*, 213–19 (transl. J.Sargeant).
- 53 Of course there are exceptions, especially in Plautus (*Pseud.*, 117–20; *Bacch.*, 505–8; *Most.*, 233–4).
- 54 Cf. e.g. Terence, *Hec.*, 448–9; *Heaut.*, 114–16; *Andr.*, 262–4.
- 55 Cf. *JR* 534–6; F.F.Abbott (1963) 194–214; J.Stinchcomb (1932–3) 441–8; O.Seel (1967) 270ff. (in his chapter ‘Generationskrise’); M.Testard (1969) 198–213. On Quintus, cf. also I.M.G.Bozic (1951) 11–25.
- 56 Plutarch, *Cic.*, 24, 6.
- 57 Cicero, *Fam.*, 16, 21 (transl. W.G.Williams). The passages quoted in the following lines are 1, 6, 2, 3.
- 58 Cicero, *Att.*, 10, 4, 5–6 (transl. E.O.Winstedt).
- 59 P.Oxy, I 119 (second/third century AD) (transl. B.P.Grenfell/A.S. Hunt).
- 60 Cf. S.Dixon (1990).
- 61 Seneca, *Prov.*, 2, 5: ‘Do you not see how fathers show their love in one way, and mothers in another? The father orders his children to be aroused from sleep in order that they may start early upon their pursuits,—even on holidays he does not permit them to be idle, and

- he draws from them sweat and sometimes tears. But the mother fondles them in her lap, wishes to keep them out of the sun, wishes them never to be unhappy, never to cry, never to toil.'
- 62 Augustine, *Conf.*, 2, 3, 7 (transl. W.Watts); 3, 11, 19; *Ac.*, 2, 2, 3 PL 32, 920; *Conf.*, 5, 8, 15.
- 63 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.*, 8, 62; Plutarch, *Cor.*, 33–6.
- 64 Cicero, *Att.*, 6, 2, 2; 6, 3, 8; 6, 7, 1.
- 65 Seneca, *Marc.*, 24, 1 (transl. J.W.Basore).
- 66 Herodian, 6, 1, 5ff.
- 67 Cf. e.g. D.Pikhaus (1990) 153–76.
- 68 *Rev. Eg.*, 1919, p. 204 (transl. A.S.Hunt/C. C.Edgar).
- 69 BGU 846 (transl. A.S.Hunt/C.C.Edgar).
- 70 Cf. *JR* 497–511. Some general studies on friendship in antiquity are L.Dugas (1976), and, for the Roman world, W.Kroll (1963) 55ff., 105ff.; P.A.Brunst (1965) 1–20; K.Meister (1967) 323–9.
- 71 Horace, *A.P.*, 166.
- 72 Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 2, 12, 1389 a 35 (transl. J.H.Freese). Cf. pp. 31ff.
- 73 Aristotle, *Nic.*, 8, 12, 4, 1161 b 34. Cf. *ibid.*, 8, 11, 5, 1161 a 25 (on the friendship between brothers).
- 74 Aristotle, *Nic.*, 8, 1, 2, 1155 a 13 (transl. H.Rackham).
- 75 Aristotle, *Nic.*, 8, 3, 4, 1156 a 24 (transl. H.Rackham). Cf. *ibid.*, 8, 5, 2, 1157 b 14; 8, 6, 1, 1158 a 2.
- 76 Aristotle, *Nic.*, 8, 3, 5, 1156 a 32 (transl. H.Rackham).
- 77 Aristotle, *Nic.*, 8, 6, 4, 1158 a 18 (transl. H.Rackham).
- 78 Cicero, *Lae.*, 20, 74; *Off.*, 1, 15, 47 (transl. W.A.Falconer). But cf. Quintilian, 1, 2, 20 (on the advantages of public schools): 'I say nothing on friendships which endure unbroken to old age having acquired the binding force of a secret duty: for initiation in the same studies has all the sanctity of initiation in the same mysteries of religion' (transl. H.E.Butler).
- 79 Apuleius, *Flor.*, 16, 9.
- 80 Cf. Plutarch, *Frat. am.*, 19, 490B.
- 81 E.g. *carmina* 19, 29, 39, 43, 54, 57. Cf. S.G.P.Small (1983) 49ff.
- 82 W.Kroll (1963) 228 (my transl.). Cf. e.g. E.A.Havelock (1939) 114ff.; E.Schäfer (1966) 37ff.; P.McGushin (1967) 85ff.
- 83 Cf. K.Büchner (1962) 224–5.
- 84 Cf. pp. 97ff. For an analysis of Catullus' (often homoerotic) poems of friendship, cf. e.g. R.Reitzenstein (1912) 15ff.; E.A.Havelock (1939) 114ff.; E.Schäfer (1966) 37ff.; P.McGushin (1967) 85ff.; S.G.P.Small (1983) 11ff.
- 85 Catullus, 73 (transl. F.W.Cornish). Other relevant poems on friendship are *carmina* 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 35, 55, 56, 68, 95, 100.
- 86 Augustine, *Conf.*, 2, 2, 2. Cf. *ibid.*, 3, 1, 1.

- 87 Cf. Augustine, *Conf.*, 4, 4, 7ff. (transl. H.Chadwick). On friendship in Augustine's life, cf. F.Lans (1930) 250–64; V.Nolte (1939); J.J. O'Meara (1954) 85ff.; M.A.McNamara (1958) 43ff.; T.J.van Bavel (1970) 23ff.; H.-G.Surmund (1978) 18ff.
- 88 But also because he sought to advance himself socially as a teacher.
- 89 Cf. pp. 110ff.
- 90 Cf. John Chrysostom, *Sacerd.*, 1, 1, 1ff. Cf. *JR* 508–9; E.Eyben (1984) 115–19.
- 91 Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.*, 43, 15–24 (transl. P.McCauley). Cf. E. Fleury (1930) 43ff.; P.Gallay (1943) 55ff.
- 92 Cf. pp. 117ff.
- 93 Cf. *JR* 512–25, and E.Eyben (1972a) 200–17.
- 94 Cicero, *Off.*, 2, 13, 46.
- 95 Seneca, *Ep.*, 11, 8; 52, 8 (transl. R.M.Gummere).
- 96 Sallust, in Nonius, p. 239. For the Emperor Julian, Marcus Aurelius was the example *par excellence* (Ammianus Marcellinus, 16, 1, 4).
- 97 Augustine, *Conf.*, 4, 14, 21–3.
- 98 Plutarch, *Cato Mai.*, 4, 1.
- 99 Quintus Cicero, *Comm. pet.*, 1, 3. Cf. p. 60.
- 100 Cicero, *Brut.*, 95, 326. Cf. p. 154.
- 101 Philostratus, *V.S.*, 2, 10, 587.
- 102 Pliny, *N.H.*, 20, 57, 160.
- 103 This Scopelian lectured at Smyrna. 'Ionians, Lydians, Carians, Maeonians, Aeolians also and Hellenes from Mysia and Phygria flocked thither to his school.... But besides these he attracted Cappadocians and Assyrians, he attracted also Egyptians and Phoenicians, the more illustrious of the Achaeans, and all the youth of Athens' (Philostratus, *V.S.*, 1, 21, 518, transl. W.C.Wright).
- 104 Philostratus, *V.S.*, 1, 21, 520. As has already been said above (cf. pp. 115ff), it was not unusual for students to be willing to stick to their teachers through thick and thin, and, if need be, suffer violence.
- 105 Philostratus, *V.S.*, 2, 10, 587 (transl. W.C.Wright).
- 106 Plutarch, *Cato Mai.*, 22, 2–5. Cf. p. 160.
- 107 Suda s.v. *Markianos*; Tac., *Ann.*, 15, 71, 9.
- 108 Seneca, *Ep.*, 108, 3. Cf. p. 164.
- 109 Quintilian, 10, 1, 125–31 (transl. H.E.Butler). Cf. H.F.Culver (1967) 26–8; W.H.Alexander (1935) 239–58.
- 110 Cicero, *Lae.*, 1, 1; *De or.*, 2, 1, 3. Cf. pp. 142–3.
- 111 Cicero, *Fam.*, 13, 29, 1 (young Plancus); 5, 8, 2 and 4 (Crassus' sons).
- 112 Cicero, *De or.*, 1, 21, 97; 2, 21, 89. Cf. p. 152.
- 113 Pliny, *Ep.*, 7, 20, 4.
- 114 Tacitus, *D.*, 2, 1 (transl. W.Peterson).

- 115 Cf. E.E.Burris (1923–4) 10–12; M.Johnston (1923–4) 88; E.de Saint Denis (1946) 9–21.
- 116 Pliny, *Ep.*, 8, 23, 1–4 (transl. W.M.L.Hutchinson). For the behaviour of most of his peers, cf. pp. 203–4.
- 117 Pliny, *Ep.*, 6, 11, 1–3. Cf. *ibid.*, 6, 6, 5–6 (young Iulius Naso).
- 118 Plutarch, *Virt. mor.*, 8, 448E.
- 119 Cf. G.Boissier (1868) 671ff.; M.Lagrange (1913) 243ff.; C.Brakman (1919) 52ff.
- 120 Fronto, *Epist. Graec.*, 7, 1; *Ad M. Caes.*, 2, 5 (transl. C.R.Haines).
- 121 Fronto, *Ad M. Caes.*, 1, 3, 4ff. (transl. C.R.Haines).
- 122 Jerome, *Ep.*, 52; 60, 11.
- 123 Augustine, *Conf.*, 4, 7, 11. Cf. *ibid.*, 6, 7, 12.
- 124 Augustine, *Ord.*, 1, 8, 23–4 PL 32, 988–9. Cf. p. 183 (Licentius as a poet, with bibliography).
- 125 Polybius, 21, 23–5 (transl. W.R.Paton).
- 126 Cf. P.Friedländer (1945) 337–51; K.Büchner (1962, 3) 42ff. (my transl.); A.-J.Festugière (1977) 180ff. Cf. E.Eyben/A.Wouters (1977) 90–119.
- 127 Cf. *JR* 469–96. Cf. W.Kroll (1988) 70–117; O.Keifer (1975); T.Hopfner (1938); A.Marcadé (1968); P.Grimal (1963); W.A.Krenkel (1978a) 165–80 and his publications mentioned in nn. 132, 137, 138, 142; C.Johns (1990); M.Foucault (1976–84); J.N.Adams (1982); A.K.Siems (1988), with a detailed bibliography (pp. 419–32).
- 128 Servius, *Aen.*, 6, 114.
- 129 Cf. p. 16.
- 130 Cf. *JR* 469–96.
- 131 Cf. pp. 133ff.
- 132 Cf. W.A.Krenkel (1977b) 613–18; *idem* (1980b) 77–88; *idem* (1981) 37–54.
- 133 Plautus, *Curc.*, 36–7 (transl. P.Nixon). Cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980)1: ‘Here is advice which few Roman gentlemen would in practice have quarrelled with through centuries.’ Sexual intercourse with respectable free-born boys and girls, with married women and widows was regarded as *stuprum* or *adulterium*.
- 134 References are in *JR* 470 n. 8.
- 135 References are in *JR* 485 n. 58, 533 n. 43.
- 136 References are in *JR* 90–2, 491 n. 84.
- 137 Cf. H.Herter (1957) 1149–1213; *idem* (1960) 70–111; W.Kroll (1988) 95ff., 97ff.; J.-N.Robert (1983) 175–205; W.A.Krenkel (1988a) 1291–7; V.Vanoyeke (1990). For male prostitution, cf. n. 142.
- 138 Cf. the references in *JR* 469 n. 2, and, more generally, W.A.Krenkel (1979b) 159–78. As a characteristic of puberty it is mentioned by Aristotle (*Gen. an.*, 1, 20, 728 a 11ff.; *Hist. an.*, 7, 1, 581 a 28ff.; *Probl.*, 30, 1 953 b 36ff.). Cf. Juvenal, 7, 238ff.: ‘[Parents must

insist that a teacher] shall be a father to the whole brood, so that they shall play no nasty game, and no nasty trick—no easy matter to watch the hands and sparkling eyes of so many youngsters!’ (transl. G.G. Ramsay).

- 139 Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.*, 13, 12, 1–2: Nero’s love for the freedwoman Acte is overlooked to avoid the risk that ‘if he were checked in this passion, his instincts would break out at the expense of women of rank’; Valerius Maximus, 7, 3, 10: a youth who suffered from a ‘forbidden’ love (*inconcessis et periculosis facibus*), is advised by his father to take refuge in the services of prostitutes (*vulgaris ac permissa Venus*), with the desired effect.
- 140 Porphyrio and Ps.-Acron on Horace, *S.*, 1, 2, 31–2.
- 141 Cicero, *Cael.*, 20, 48 (transl. R. Gardner). Cf. W.Kroll (1988) 110; R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 1–2. Cicero is thinking about Clodia, a lady who by her conduct and love-affairs excluded herself from decent society.
- 142 Cf. W.A.Krenkel (1978a) 49–55; *idem* (1979a) 179–89; *idem* (1988b) 191–200; L.Hermans (1990) 41–2; 169 e.v.
- 143 Cf. *JR* 472–5.
- 144 Juvenal, 14, 38ff. (transl. G.G.Ramsay).
- 145 Quintilian, 1, 2, 4–8. Cf. Pliny, *Ep.*, 3, 3, 3–4.
- 146 Cicero, *Rep.*, 4, 4, 4; *Off.*, 1, 5, 129.
- 147 Quintilian, 1, 2, 4–8.
- 148 Scholium on Persius, 1, 133.
- 149 Cf. T.Hägg (1983) *passim*; M.Fusillo (1989) *passim*; R.Johne (1989) 159ff.; D.Konstan (1990) 186–205. Cf. T.P.Wiseman (1985) 118: ‘In all the Greek surviving novels, the vicissitudes and obligations of the separated lovers apply equally to hero and heroine; he too has to be faithful, he too has to be pure to the end.’
- 150 Cf. A.Betenski (1980) 291–9; W.Fitzgerald (1984–5) 73–86; R.D. Brown (1987) *passim* (on Lucretius).
- 151 Horace, *S.*, 1, 2. On Horace’s sexual morals, cf. C.S.Dessen (1968b) 200–8; B.Baldwin (1970) 460–5.
- 152 Piso, in Cicero, *Fam.*, 9, 22, 2.
- 153 Cf. p. 13.
- 154 Plautus, *Trin.*, 223ff.; 264ff. Lysiteles as well as Lesbonicus is discussed by J.André (1966) 107ff. in his book on the Roman *otium*. For this scholar, they are the typical representatives of a period of transition—the years after the second Punic war—in which old and new values came into conflict with each other.
- 155 Cf. E.Strathmann/P.Keseling (1950) 749–95; A.Rouselle (1983) (late antiquity).
- 156 Iamblichus, *V.Pyth.*, 31, 210. Cf. Ocellus Lucanus, 54; Aristoxenus, in Stobaeus, 4, 37, 4, 5.

- 157 Musonius Rufus, fr. 12. Most remarkable are the following words: 'Men who are not wantons or immoral are bound to consider sexual intercourse justified only when it occurs in marriage and is indulged in for the purpose of begetting children, since that is lawful, but unjust and unlawful when it is mere pleasure-seeking, even in marriage' (transl. C.E.Lutz).
- 158 Catullus, 63. Cf. p. 187 with n. 278 (bibliography).
- 159 Cf. Lucian, *Dea Syr.*, 51. Cf. A.D.Nock (1939) 173, 175.
- 160 Eusebius, *H.E.*, 6, 8, 1ff.
- 161 Cf. pp. 159ff.
- 162 Cicero, *Fam.*, 9, 26, 2.
- 163 Nicolaus of Damascus, *V.Caes.*, 5; 15. But see Suetonius, *Aug.*, 68 (cf. p. 244).
- 164 Seneca, *Marc.*, 2, 3; 24, 3 (transl. J.W.Basore).
- 165 Augustine, *Conf.*, 6, 11, 20; 6, 12, 22.
- 166 Augustine, *Conf.*, 6, 12, 21. Other examples are in *JR* 473-4 and n. 17.
- 167 Ovid, *Met.*, 3, 339ff. Cf. J. Van Lumey (1955); H.Dörrie (1967) 54-75; H.Cancik (1967) 42-53; A.V.Rankin (1974) 71-94; G.Rosati (1976) 83-108.
- 168 Cf. Euripides, *Hipp.*, 84ff., 616ff., 948ff., 1002ff., 1389ff. Cf. A.-J. Festugière (1954) 10ff.; F.Mench (1976) 75-88.
- 169 Thus A.-J.Festugière (1954) 13.
- 170 A.-J.Festugière (1954) 15.
- 171 F.Mench (1976) 87. The concepts 'shame-' and 'guilt-culture' are borrowed from E.R.Dodds.
- 172 Cf. E.Eyben (1985) 434ff., with bibliography.
- 173 For bibliography, cf. p. 24 with n. 109.
- 174 Cf. E.Eyben (1980-1) 75 n. 232.
- 175 *Augustan History, Ael.*, 5, 11.
- 176 Jerome, *Iov.*, 1, 49 PL 23, 281.
- 177 R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 17.
- 178 Cf. e.g. P.Csillag (1976); L.F.Raditsa (1980) 278-339.
- 179 Augustine, *Conf.*, 6, 12, 22ff.
- 180 Cf. e.g. Terence, *Hec.*, 114ff.; Plautus, *Merc.*, 46ff.
- 181 Apuleius, *Met.*, 8, 1, 5ff. (transl. W.Adlington).
- 182 Cf. E.Eyben (1985) 439ff., with bibliography.
- 183 Plutarch, *Lyc. et Numa*, 4, 1-2 (transl. B.Perrin).
- 184 I mention only M.Durry (1956) 227-43. Cf. E.Eyben (1985) 439ff.
- 185 Cf. *JR* 475-9. Some general studies on homosexuality in—especially—the Greek world are W.Kroll (1921) 897-906; H.-I.Marrou (1965) 61ff.; A.Bork (1961) 39ff.; K.Dover (1978); L.P.Wilkinson (1979) 111-42; F.Buffière (1980); H.Patzler (1982); D.M.Halperin (1990). On homosexuality in Rome cf. W.Kroll (1988) 88-94; J.Boswell (1980)

- 61–78; P.Veyne (1981) 76–8; S.Lilja (1982); R.Macmullen (1982) 484–502; L.Hermans (1990); R.Lambert (1984) 75ff.
- 186 Cf. Cicero, *Tusc.*, 4, 33, 70; 5, 20, 58. Cf. R.Macmullen (1982) 484ff.; L.Hermans (1990) 72 n. 92.
- 187 The problem was not whether somebody was homosexual or heterosexual, but whether one played the active or the passive role. Cf. J.Boswell (1980) 74ff.; P.Veyne (1981) 76–8; S.Lilja (1982) 86; L.Hermans (1990) 40 and nn. 37–8.
- 188 R.Macmullen (1982) 491–2, who continues: ‘While there is no dispute about the prevalent condemnation of acts at the bad end of the scale, it has been fairly asked whether anyone objected to homosexual pleasure in itself, at the higher end of the scale. The answer is clearly Yes.’
- 189 Cf. *JR* 477–8 and nn. 27–9; W.Kroll (1988) 93. Perhaps the decisive factor was the incompatibility of the passive role with a Roman soldier’s dignity. Cf. S.Lilja (1982) 122.
- 190 Cicero, *Tusc.*, 4, 33, 70; 5, 20, 58. For Cicero’s views on homosexuality, cf. S. Lilja (1982) 122ff.
- 191 Quintilian, 1, 2, 2; 1, 3, 17; 2, 2, 3; 2, 2, 14–15. Cf. Juvenal, 10, 224, and L.Hermans (1990) 62 n. 44, 124 n. 21.
- 192 Juvenal, 10, 295–8.
- 193 Thus F.Buffière (1980) 610 n. 18; R.Lambert (1984) 83–4.
- 194 *Greek Anthology*, 12.4 (transl. W.R.Paton). For the age of the *eromenos*, cf. *JR* 475 n. 19, and F.Buffière (1980) 605ff.; L.Hermans (1990) 68–9.
- 195 Meleager, in *Greek Anthology*, 12, 125; Lucian, V.H., 2, 28. Cf. F. Buffière (1980) 610–11.
- 196 E.g. Horace, C., 4, 10, 2: *cum veniet pluma*. Cf. *JR* 475 n. 19; F. Buffière (1980) 611ff.; G.Devereux (1988) 213 and n. 25.
- 197 E.g. Ovid, *Her.*, 15, 85–6. Cf. *JR* 475 n. 19.
- 198 Cf. L.P.Wilkinson (1979) 136–7: The qualification “free-born” highlights the fundamental difference between the attitude of Athenians and Romans, of Solon and Augustus, on this matter. Whereas Solon had forbidden slaves to partake in homosexual practices, at Rome it was *only* slaves and other non-citizens who could legitimately be used for them; and they could be used without restraint. There was something sacred about the person of a Roman citizen’. In Greece it was not permitted to be an adult *eromenos*. Cf. F.Buffière (1980) 617: ‘If it was normal for a beautiful lad to let himself be loved, it was highly abnormal and even odious for him to continue to do so once he reached manhood. A child could play the role of a woman with no fear of reproach; a man could not; it was against his dignity’ (my transl.).
- 199 Quintilian, 4, 2, 69.

- 200 Valerius Maximus, 6, 1, 9. Cf. Livy, 8, 28.
- 201 Plutarch, *Marc.*, 2, 3–4; Valerius Maximus, 6, 1, 7.
- 202 Cicero, *Mil.*, 4, 9.
- 203 Macrobius, *Sat.*, 3, 17, 4. According to some scholars, the *Lex Scantinia* (149BC) punished homosexual relations with a fine of 100, 000 sesterces. But see S. Lilja (1982) 112–21; J. Boswell (1985) 65ff.; L. Hermans (1990) 42–3, who believe that this law has nothing to do with homosexuality.
- 204 Tacitus, *Ann.*, 14, 20, 5.
- 205 Suetonius, *Aug.*, 68 (transl. J.C. Rolfe). Other references are in *JR* 476 and n. 22. Cf. W. Kroll (1988) 88ff.; W. A. Krenkel (1980a) 65–76: ‘Sex and political propaganda formed an entity. Allegations were meant to undermine the enemy’s image. Such statements are *topoi* and should not be taken at face value’ (p. 76); R. MacMullen (1982) 490ff., who comments: ‘It seems safe to conclude that “the man in the street”...could be assumed to be the foe of male homosexuality’; L. Hermans (1990) 45–6 and nn. 58ff.
- 206 W. A. Krenkel (1980a) 65–76. Cf. the publications mentioned in n. 132.
- 207 Cf. Cicero, *Cael.*, 3, 6: ‘Now as to the reproaches cast on his morals, as to all the clamour made by his accusers, not criminal charges but abuse and slander, Marcus Caelius will never feel this so bitterly as to regret that he was born not unhandsome (*non deformen esse natum*). For such slanders are commonly uttered against all who in their youth have been distinguished by a becoming figure and noble appearance. But abuse is one thing, accusation is another’ (transl. R. Gardner).
- 208 Cicero, *Phil.*, 2, 18, 44–5 (transl. W. C. A. Ker). Cf. S. Lilja (1982) 93–4; L. Hermans (1990) 183–5 who believes in the sincerity of the love between Antony and Curio.
- 209 Polybius, 31, 25, 4–5.
- 210 Catullus, 61, 126–30; 146–8. According to S. Lilja (1982) 59, this is a specifically Roman passage.
- 211 Cf. J. Boswell (1980) 73–4; E. Cantarella (1988); L. Hermans (1990) 34–7. According to S. Lilja (1982) 101, the commonness of bisexuality is reflected in numerous Pompeian inscriptions. Cf. Horace, *Epod.*, 11, 4: *mollibus in pueris aut in puellis urere*; S., 2, 3, 325: *mille puellarum, puerorum mille furores*. On Horace and (homo)sexuality, cf. B. Baldwin (1970) 460–5; S. Lilja (1982) 70ff.
- 212 Catullus, 48. Cf. e.g. *carmina* 15, 16, 21, 24, 81, 99, and B. Arkins (1982) 104ff. (with bibliography); S. Lilja (1982) 51ff.
- 213 Cf. C. W. Clairmont (1966); R. Lambert (1984); J. Boswell (1985) 84–5; L. Hermans (1990) 181–2.
- 214 *Augustan History*, *Hadr.*, 14, 5. Cf. Dio, 69, 11, 2–4.

- 215 Cf. p. 228, where Marcus Aurelius calls himself the *erastes* of his ideal, Fronto.
- 216 Virgil, *Aen.*, 5, 295–6; 9, 176ff. Cf. A.Kosthorst (1934) 100f.; C. Colmant (1951) 89–100; G.E.Duckworth (1967) 129–50; L.P. Wilkinson (1979) 138–40; G.T.Fitzgerald (1972) 114–37; S. Lilja (1982) 62ff., esp. 66–7; L.Hermans (1990) 16 and n. 28. Another pair of ‘lovers’ were the Italians Cydon and Clytius. Cf. Virgil, *Aen.*, 10, 324–7. For the—more or less non-sexual—homosexuality in the *Eclogues*, cf. S.Lilja (1982) 62–5.
- 217 Cf. *jR* 479–96, and P.Grimal (1963) 154ff.; H.Cancik-Lindemayer (1972) 47ff.; R.O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 1–18; N.P.Gross (1985).
- 218 Polybius, 31, 25, 4.
- 219 As Sallust (*Cat.*, 25, 3) tells us of Sempronia.
- 220 Cf., E.Bertin (1879); D.R.Lee (1919) 51ff.; J.André (1966) 102ff.; H.-W.Rissom (1971) 49ff.
- 221 On the elegiac poets, cf. A.W.Allen (1950) 255–77; P.Grimal (1963) 154ff.; S.Lilja (1978); G.Luck (1969) 82ff.; R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980); P.Veyne (1983). On Propertius, cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 82–148; on Tibullus, cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 149–89; on Ovid, cf. J.B. Solodow (1977) 106–27; R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 239–87; A.-F.Sabot (1976); M.Myerowitz (1985). On Catullus, cf. G.Lieberg (1962); R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 19–61; B.Arkins (1982) 46ff.; J.Granarolo (1982); W.Kroll (1988) 113–14.
- 222 According to R.O. A.M. Lyne (1980) 8ff., the *demi-monde* is a Greek import which in the Rome of Plautus’ time did not properly or widely exist. But ‘Terence gives us vivid pictures of a Greek-style *demi-monde* and we can now assume, because of Polybius’ corroborating evidence [cf. p. 22] and because we find no signs of the adaption we find in Plautus, that they bear some resemblance to contemporary Roman life’ (p. 9). Of course, Plautus and Terence find inspiration in Greek poetry, but, as J.Griffin (1976) 88 says, ‘not only does literature reflect the experience of life, but also in its turns it affects actual behaviour; and can do so with great force’. Cf. Cicero, *Rosc. Am.*, 16, 47 (on comedians): ‘I think, in fact, that these fictions of the poets are intended to give us a representation of our manners in the character of others and a vivid picture of our daily life’ (transl. J.H.Freese).
- 223 W.Kroll (1963) 169 (my transl). Cf. N.Holzberg (1990) 14.
- 224 Longus, 1, 17–19 (transl. J.M.Edmonds). The awakening of love in Chloe is described in similar words in 1, 13, 1ff. On Daphnis and Chloe, cf. T.Hägg (1983) 35–41; J.J.Winkler (1990) 101–26; R.Johne (1989) 168–9.

- 225 Terence, *Phorm.*, 80ff. Cf. *JR* 480–1 and n. 35. The Greek novels, too, have mostly—Daphnis and Chloe are an exception—to do with love at first sight. Cf. e.g. Heliodor, 3, 5.
- 226 Quintilian, 6, 2, 6. Cf. *JR* 481 and n. 37.
- 227 Plautus, *Poen.*, 275–8. Cf. *JR* 481 and n. 38.
- 228 Tibullus, 2, 6, 44. Cf. *JR* 482 and n. 39.
- 229 E.g. Propertius, 2, 3, 9ff.; Ovid., *Ars*, 3, 311ff.
- 230 Ovid, *Am.*, 2, 4, 45–6; *Ars*, 2, 663ff.
- 231 Horace, *S.*, 1, 2, 28ff.
- 232 Ovid, *Am.*, 2, 19, 3.
- 233 Ovid, *Ars*, 3, 571–3.
- 234 Ovid, *Ars*, 1, 727: *palleat omnis amans*. Cf. the examples in *JR* 483 and 44.
- 235 Catullus, 51, 1–12. Cf. *JR* 483 and n. 45.
- 236 For references to the commonplaces mentioned in this paragraph, cf. *JR* 483–4.
- 237 Propertius, 2, 23, 23–4 (transl. G.P.Goold). Cf. *JR* 404 and n. 50; F.O.Copley (1947) 285–300; H.Cancik-Lindemaier (1972) 72ff.; R. O. A. M. Lyne (1979) 117–30; *idem* (1980) 78ff.; P.Murgatroyd (1981) 589–606; N.Holzberg (1990) 12–16 (the lover as a slave of his mistress); A Spies (1978); P.Murgatroyd (1975) 59–79; R. O. A. M. Lyne (1980) 67ff. (the lover as a soldier of love). Both topics (the *servitium/militia amoris*) seem to be more typical for Roman than for Greek poetry.
- 238 References are in *JR* 484–5.
- 239 References are in *JR* 485.
- 240 References are in *JR* 485–6.
- 241 Cf. F.O.Copley (1956); J.C.Yardley (1978) 19–34.
- 242 References are in *JR* 486.
- 243 Seneca, *N.Q.*, 4 Pr. 6.
- 244 References are in *JR* 487.
- 245 Cf. *JR* 487 and nn. 68–9.
- 246 Propertius, 1, 11, 23–6; 2, 7, 19ff.; 2, 6, 41–2 (transl. G.P.Goold).
- 247 Plautus, *Bacch.*, 193 (transl. P.Nixon). Other references are in *JR* 487–8.
- 248 Catullus, 5 (transl. F.W.Cornish). Cf. Catullus 7, and C.Segal (1968) 284–301.
- 249 Catullus, 72, 3–4.
- 250 Propertius, 2, 18, 33–4.
- 251 Ovid, *Am.*, 1, 10, 3.
- 252 Terence, *Andr.*, 694–7 (transl. J. Sargeaunt).
- 253 E.g. Ovid, *Ars*, 3, 567ff. Cf. *JR* 489 and n. 75.
- 254 Terence, *Andr.*, 555 (transl. J.Sargeaunt).
- 255 Propertius, 2, 29, 1ff.

- 256 Catullus, 37, 39, 40, 77, 82, 91. Cf. p. 191.
- 257 Lucretius, 4, 1139ff.
- 258 Cf. *jR* 490 n. 80.
- 259 Propertius, 2, 13, 35–6 (transl. G.P.Goold).
- 260 Propertius, 1, 12, 20. Cf. *jR* 490 and n. 81.
- 261 Propertius, 1, 6, 27–8. Other references are in *jR* 494ff. and nn. 94ff.
- 262 References are in *jR* 495–6 and nn. 101–4.
- 263 E.g. Terence, *Hec.*, 114ff.; Plautus, *Merc.*, 46ff.
- 264 Cf. G.Lieberg (1962).
- 265 Catullus, 76 (transl. F.W.Cornish). Cf. L.Pepe (1950) 300–9; J.Ferguson (1956) 52–8; I.Willie (1964) 89–95; C.A.Rubino (1975) 289–98; B.Arkins (1982) 92ff.; P.Pietquin (1986) 351–66. On Propertius' farewell to Cynthia (3, 24; 3, 25), cf. L.Alfonsi (1956) 59–65; E.Burck (1959) 191–211.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Frank F., 'The career of a Roman student', in *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome: Essays and Sketches*, New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1963, pp. 191–214 (first publ. 1909).
- Ableitinger-Grünberger, Doris, *Der junge Horaz und die Politik: Studien zur 7. und 16. Epode* (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, N.F., 2. Reihe, 42), Heidelberg: Winter, 1971.
- Adams, J.N., *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London: Duckworth, 1982.
- Adler, Eve, *Catullan Self-Revelation* (Monographs in Classical Studies), New York: Arno Press, 1981.
- Afzelius, A., 'Lex Annalis', *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 8 (1946–7), 263–78.
- Alexander, William H., 'The professor's deadly vengeance', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 4 (1935), 239–58.
- Alfaric, Prosper, *L'Evolution intellectuelle de Saint Augustin: Du manichéisme au néoplatonisme*, Paris: Nourry, 1928.
- Alföldi, Andreas, *Oktavians Aufstieg zur Macht* (Antiquitas, 1, Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte, 25), Bonn: Habelt, 1976.
- Alfonsi, Luigi, 'Il pensiero della pace nell'elegia latina', *La scuola cattolica*, 73 (1945), 61–8.
- 'Tra l'ozio e l'inerzia', *Aevum*, 28 (1954), 375–6.
- 'L'addio all'amore di Propertio', *Orpheus*, 3 (1956), 59–65.
- 'Otium e vita d'amore negli elegiaci augustei', in *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni*, Milan: Bompiani, 1956, pp. 187–209.
- Allen, Archibald W., "'Sincerity" and the Roman elegists', *Classical Philology*, 45 (1950), 145–60.
- 'Elegy and the classical attitude toward love: Propertius I, 1', *Yale Classical Studies*, 11 (1950), 255–77.
- Allen, Walter, 'On the importance of young men in Ciceronian politics', *The Classical Journal*, 33 (1937–8), 357–9.
- Amiotti, G., 'Religione e politica nell' iniziazione romana: L'assunzione della toga virile', *Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia Antica dell'Università del Sacro Cuore*, 7 (1981), 131–40.
- Anderson, William S., 'Persius and the rejection of society', in *Essays on Roman Satire*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982, pp. 169–93 (first publ. in *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Rostock*, 15 (1966), 409–16).
- André, Jean-Marie, *L'Otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine des origines à l'époque augustéenne* (Publications de la Faculté des

- Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Paris. Série 'Recherches', 30), Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.
- Antin, Paul, 'Autour du songe de saint Jérôme', *Revue des études latines*, 41 (1963), 350–77.
- Argyle, A.W., 'The ancient university of Alexandria', *The Classical Journal*, 69 (1974), 348–50.
- Ariès, Philippe, *L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien régime*, Paris: Plon, 1960.
- Arkins, Brian, *Sexuality in Catullus* (Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien, 8), Hildesheim [etc.]: Georg Olms, 1982.
- Astin, Alan E., *The 'Lex Annalis' before Sulla* (Latomus, 32), Brussels: Latomus, 1958 (first publ. in *Latomus*, 16 (1957), 588–613; 17 (1958) 49–64).
- Austin, R.G. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Caelio Oratio*, 3rd edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969 (first publ. 1960).
- Axelson, Bertil, 'Die Synonyme *adulescens* und *iuuenis*', in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes, offerts à Jean Marouzeau*, Paris: Hachette, 1948, pp. 7–17.
- Aymard, Jacques, *Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins* (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 171) (diss.) Paris: de Boccard, 1951.
- Baldwin, Barry, 'Horace on sex', *American Journal of Philology*, 91 (1970), 460–5.
- 'Young and old in imperial Rome', in *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Stephen Bertman, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976, pp. 221–33.
- Balsdon, J.P. V.D., *Roman Women: Their History and Habits*, 2nd edn, London: The Bodley Head, 1974.
- Bardon, Henry, *Propositions sur Catulle* (Latomus, 118), Brussels: Latomus, 1970.
- Bardy, Gustave, 'Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie', *Recherches de science religieuse*, 27 (1937), 65–90.
- 'Un élève de Saint Augustin: Licentius', *L'année théologique augustinienne*, 14 (1954), 55–79.
- Bayet, Jean, *Littérature latine*, avec collab. de Louis Nougaret (Collection U), 3rd edn, Paris: Armand Colin, 1965.
- Beaujeu, Jean, 'Le problème de l'originalité de Terence', *L'Information littéraire*, 11 (1959), 9–19.
- Berg, William, *Early Virgil*, London: Athlone Press, 1974.
- Berger, A., 'Minores', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 15, 2 (1932), cols. 1860–89.
- Bertin, E., *De Plautinis et Terentianis adolescentibus amatoribus* (diss.) Paris: G. Pedone-Lauriel, 1879.

- Bertman, Stephen (ed.), *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976.
- Betenski, Aya, 'Lucretius and love', *Classical World*, 73 (1980), 291–9.
- Bidez, Joseph, 'Le philosophe Jamblique et son école', *Revue des études grecques*, 32 (1919), 29–40.
- 'La jeunesse de l'empereur Julien', *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* (1921), 197–216.
- Birley, Eric, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army*, Kendal: T. Wilson, 1953.
- Birt, Theodor, *Pontifex und 'Sexagenarii de ponte'*, *Rheinisches Museum*, N.F. 75 (1926), 115–26.
- Bloch, G., 'De l'authenticité de l'édit censorial de 92 a. I.C. contre les rhéteurs latins', *Kleio*, 3 (1903), 68–73.
- Blomenkamp, P., 'Erziehung', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 6 (1966), cols. 502–59.
- Blümner, Hugo, *Die römische Privataltertümer* (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 4, 2, 2), 3rd edn, Munich: Beck, 1911.
- Bo, Domenico, *Genitori e figli nelle commedie di Terenzio*, Turin: Einaudi, 1976.
- Boardman, John, and La Rocca, Eugenio, *Eros in Greece*, London: Murray, 1975.
- Boissier, Gaston, 'La jeunesse de Marc Aurèle', *Revue des deux mondes*, 38 (1868), 671–98.
- 'Caelius: la jeunesse romaine au temps de César', in *Cicéron et ses amis: Etude sur la société romaine du temps de César*, 14th edn, Paris: Hachette, 1910, pp. 167–219 (first publ. in *Revue des deux mondes*, 34 (1864), 41–74).
- Boll, Franz, 'Die Lebensalter: Ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethologie und zur Geschichte der Zahlen', in *Kleine Schriften zur Sternkunde des Altertums*, hrsg. und eingeleitet von Viktor Stegeman, Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1950, pp. 156–224 (first publ. in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 31 (1913), 89–145).
- Bonnefond, Marianne, 'Le sénat républicain et les conflits de generations', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome*, 94 (1982), 175–225.
- Bonner, Stanley F., *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1969.
- *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*, London: Methuen & Co., 1977.
- Bork, Arnold, *Der junge Grieche: Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Jugendpsychologie* (Lebendige Antike), Zürich: Artemis, 1961.
- Borzsák, Istvan, 'Otium catullianum', in *Antike Lyrik*, ed. Werner Eisenhut, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970, pp. 97–108.

- Boswell, John, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Boucher, Jean-Paul, *Etudes sur Properce: Problèmes d'inspiration et d'art*, (diss.) Paris: de Boccard, 1965.
- Bouché-Leclercq, Auguste, 'L'université d'Athènes sous les empereurs', *Revue de Paris*, 16 (1909), 741–63.
- Bowersock, Glenn W., *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- *Approaches to the Second Sophistic*, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1974.
- Boyancé, Pierre, 'Properce', in *L'Influence grecque sur la poésie latine de Catulle à Ovide: six exposés et discussions* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, 2), Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1956, pp. 169–222.
- Božić, I.M. Garrido, 'Quintus filius', *Greece and Rome*, 20 (1951), 11–25.
- Bradley, Keith R., 'The chronology of Nero's visit to Greece AD 66/67', *Latomus*, 37 (1978), 61–72.
- Brakman, Cornelis, 'Het onderwijs van Fronto aan Marcus Aurelius', in *Opstellen over onderwerpen uit de Latijnse Letterkunde*, 1, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1919, pp. 52–70.
- Brassloff, Stephan, 'Aetas legitima', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung*, 22 (1901), 169–94.
- Brink, Charles O., *Horace on Poetry. II: The 'Ars Poetica'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Brinkmann, August, 'Gregors des Thaumaturgen "Panegyricus auf Origenes"', *Rheinisches Museum*, N.F. 56 (1901), 55–76.
- Broege, Valerie, 'The generation gap in Catullus and the lyric poetry of Horace', in *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Stephen Bertman, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976, p. 171–203.
- Brouwers, Jean H., *Horatius en Propertius over epiek en lyriek* (diss.), Nijmegen: Gebr. Janssen, 1967.
- Brown, Robert D., *Lucretius on Love and Sex: Commentary on 'De rerum natura' IV, 1030–1278 with Prolegomena, Text and Translation* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, 15), Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Brunt, Peter A., 'Amicitia in the late Roman Republic', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 191 (1965), 1–20.
- *Italian Manpower: 225 BC-AD 14*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Büchner, Karl, 'M.Tullius Cicero', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 7 A 1 (1939), pp. 827–1274.
- *Römische Literaturgeschichte: Ihre Grundzüge in interpretierender Darstellung*, 3rd edn (Kröners Taschenausgabe, 247), Stuttgart: Kröner, 1962.

- Buffière, Felix, *Eros adolescent: La pédérastie dans la Grèce antique*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1980.
- Burck, Erich, 'Römische Wesenszüge der augusteischen Liebeselegie', *Hermes*, 80 (1952), 163–200.
- 'Abschied von der Liebesdichtung (Propertius 3, 24 und 25)', *Hermes*, 87 (1959), 191–211.
- 'Liebesbindung und Liebesbefreiung: Die Lebenswahl des Propertius in den Elegien 1, 6 und 3, 21', in *Vom Menschenbild in der römischen Literatur. Ausgewählte Schriften*, hrsg. von Eckard Lefèvre, 2 (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, N.F. Reihe 2, Band 72), Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1966, pp. 349–72.
- 'Drei Grundwerte der römischen Lebensordnung (*Labor moderatio pietas*)', in *Römertum. Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Arbeiten aus den Jahren 1921 bis 1961*, hrsg. von Hans Oppermann (Wege der Forschung, 18), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967, pp. 35–65 (first publ. in *Gymnasium*, 58 (1951), 161–83).
- Burris, Eli E., 'Pliny and the spirit of youth', *The Classical Weekly*, 17 (1923–4), 10–12.
- Cadiou, René, *La Jeunesse d'Origène: Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie au début du III^e siècle* (Études de théologie historique, 20), Paris: Beauchesne, 1936.
- Cairns, Francis, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Cameron, Alan, *Porphyrius: The Charioteer*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Cancik, Hubert, 'Spiegel der Erkenntnis (zu Ovid, *Met.* III, 339–510)', *Der altsprachliche Unterricht*, 10, 1 (1967), 42–53.
- Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard, 'Ehe und Liebe: Entwürfe griechischer Philosophen und römischer Dichter', in *Zum Thema Frau in Kirche und Gesellschaft. Zur Unmündigkeit verurteilt?*, hrsg. von Hubert Cancik et al., Stuttgart: KBW, 1972, pp. 47–79.
- Cantarella, Eva, *Secondo natura: La bisessualità nel mondo antico* (Nuova bibliotheca di cultura, 289), Roma: Riuniti, 1988.
- Capes, W.W., *University Life in Ancient Athens*, New York: Folcroft Library, 1977 (first publ. 1922).
- Carcopino, Jerome, *La vie quotidienne à Rome à l'apogée de l'empire*, Paris: Hachette, 1939.
- *Les Secrets de la correspondance de Cicéron*, Paris: Artisan du Livre, 1947.

- Carney, T.F., *Bureaucracy in Traditional Society: Romano-Byzantine Bureaucracies Viewed from Within*, Lawrence, Kan.: Coronado Press, 1971.
- Carp, Teresa C., 'Puer senex in Roman and medieval thought', *Latomus*, 39 (1980), 736–9.
- Castellanos, Nicolás, 'El problema educativo de la adolescencia en san Agustín', *Augustinus*, 8 (1963), 349–94.
- Castrén, Paavo, *Ordo populusque Pompeianus: Policy and Society in Roman Pompeii* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, 8), Rome: Bardi, 1975.
- Cèbe, Jean-Pierre, 'Sur les trivialités de Catulle', *Revue des études latines*, 43 (1965), 221–9.
- Chalk, H.H.O., 'Eros and the Lesbian pastorals of Longos', in *Beiträge zum griechischen Liebesroman*, hrsg. von Hans Gärtner (Olms Studien, 20), Hildesheim: Olms, 1984, pp. 388–407.
- Christes, Johannes, *Der frühe Lucilius: Rekonstruktion und Interpretation des XXVI. Buches sowie von Teilen des XXX. Buches* (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, N.F. 39), Heidelberg: Winter, 1971.
- Clairmont, Christoph W., *Die Bildnisse des Antinous: Ein Beitrag zur Porträtplastik unter Kaiser Hadrian* (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana, 6), Neuchâtel: P. Attinger, 1966.
- Clarke, Martin L., *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey*, 3rd edn, London: Cohen & West, 1966.
- 'Cicero at school', *Greece and Rome*, N.S. 15 (1968), 18–22.
- *Higher Education in the Ancient World*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971.
- 'Latin love poets and the biographical approach', *Greece and Rome*, N.S. 23 (1976), 132–9.
- Classen, C. Jochim, 'Cicero's Rede für Caelius', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 1, 3 (1973), 66–94.
- Coffman, George R., 'Old age from Horace to Chaucer: some literary affinities and adventures of an idea', *Speculum*, 9 (1934), 249–77.
- Collinet, Paul, 'Contributions a l'histoire du droit romain. I. La puberté et la plena pubertas', *Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 24 (1900), 366–84.
- *Histoire de l'école de droit de Beyrouth (Etudes historiques sur le droit de Justinien, tome II)*, Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1925.
- Collins, John H., 'Tullia's engagement and marriage to Dolabella', *The Classical Journal*, 47 (1951–2), 164–8, 186.
- Colmant, Paul, 'L'épisode de Nisus et Euryale ou le poème de l'amitié (Enéide IX, 176–502)', *Les études classiques*, 19 (1951), 89–100.
- 'Les quatre ages de la vie: Horace, *Art poétique*, 153–175', *Les études classiques*, 24 (1956), 58–63.

- Conde Guerri, Eleana, 'Consideraciones sobre los iuvenes en la obra de L.A.Seneca', *Hispania antiqua*, 6 (1976), 221-32.
- Copley, Frank O., 'Servitium amoris in the Roman elegists', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 78 (1947), 285-300.
- 'Emotional conflict and its significance in the Lesbia-poems of Catullus', *American Journal of Philology*, 70 (1949), 22-40.
- *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry* (American Philological Association. Monographs, 17), Middletown, Conn.: Scholar's Press, 1956.
- Courcelle, Pierre, 'Boèce et l'école d'Alexandrie', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome*, 52 (1935), 185-223.
- 'Reflexions d'Isidore de Seville sur la vie du jeune Augustin', *Latomus*, 21 (1962), 520-41.
- *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin*, 2nd edn, Paris: de Boccard, 1968.
- 'Le jeune Augustin, second Catilina', *Revue des études anciennes*, 73 (1971), 141-50.
- 'Intempesta nocte', in: *Mélanges W.Seston*, Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1974, pp. 127-34.
- Cramer, Frederick H., 'Why did Roman universities fail?', *Harvard Educational Review*, 9 (1939), 204-28.
- Crook, John A., 'Patria potestas', *Classical Quarterly*, 61 (1967), 113-22.
- Csillag, Pál, *The Augustan Laws on Family Relations*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976.
- Culver, H.F., 'Quintilian's condemnation of Seneca', *The Classical Bulletin*, 44 (1967), 26-8.
- Cumont, Franz, *Lux Perpetua*, Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1949.
- Daly, Lawrence J., 'St Augustine's *Confessions* and Erik Erikson's *Young Man Luther*: Conversion as "identity crisis"', *Augustiniana*, 31 (1981), 183-96.
- Daly, Lloyd W., 'Roman study abroad', *American Journal of Philology*, 71 (1950), 40-58.
- Daniels, Marion L., 'Personal revelation in Catullus 64', *The Classical Journal*, 62 (1967), 351-6.
- Daube, David, 'Did Macedo murder his father?', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung*, 65 (1947), 261-311.
- 'The filius familias', in *Roman Law: Linguistic, Social and Philosophical Aspects* (The Gray Lectures), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1969, pp. 75-91.

- David, Jean-Michel, 'Promotion civique et droit à la parole: L.Licinius Crassus, les accusateurs et les rhéteurs latins', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome*, 91 (1979), 135–81.
- Davies, Roy W., 'Joining the Roman army', *Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn und des Vereins von Altertumsfreunden im Rheinlande*, 169 (1969), 208–32.
- Day, Archibald A., *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy*, 2nd edn, Hildesheim: Olms, 1972.
- de la Ville de Mirmont, H., *La Jeunesse d'Ovide*, Paris: Fontemoing, 1905.
- de Saint-Denis, E., 'Pline le Jeune et l'éducation de la jeunesse', *Revue universitaire*, 55 (1946), 9–21.
- de Sanctis, Antonio, *Properzio: Saggio d'interpretazione psicologica* (Bibliotheca Biographica, 9), Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1973.
- Degler, Carl N., *Is There a History of Women?*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Delorme, Jean, *Gymnasion: Etude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire romain)* (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 196), Paris: de Boccard, 1960.
- Demos, John and Demos, Virginia, 'Adolescence in historical perspective', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 31 (1969), 632–8.
- den Boeft, J., 'Christenen en onderwijs in de eerste vier eeuwen', *Lampas*, 14 (1981), 210–28.
- Deroux, Carl, 'A propos de l'attitude politique de Catulle', *Latomus*, 29 (1970), 608–31.
- 'L'identité de Lesbie', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 1, 3 (1973), 390–416.
- 'Le plus mauvais de tous les poètes et le meilleur de tous les avocats', in *Hommages à Henry Bardy*, ed. M. Renard and P. Laurens, Brussels: Latomus, 1985a, pp. 124–38.
- 'Catulle et Cicéron ou les raisons d'un silence', *Les études classiques*, 53 (1985b), 221–46.
- Desmouliez, André, 'Sur la polémique de Cicéron et des atticistes', *Revue des études latines*, 30 (1952), 168–85.
- Dessau, Hermann, 'Das Alter der römischen Municipalbeamten', *Hermes*, 53 (1918), 221–4.
- Dessen, Cynthia S., *Iunctura Callidus Acri: A Study of Persius' Satires* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, 59), Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968a.
- 'The sexual and financial mean in Horace's *Serm.*, 1, 2', *American Journal of Philology*, 89 (1968b), 200–8.
- Devereux, George, 'Greek pseudo-homosexuality and the "Greek Miracle"', in *Sexualität und Erotik in der Antike*, hrsg. von Andreas

- Karsten Siems (Wege der Forschung, 605), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988, pp. 206–31 (first publ. in *Symbolae Osloenses*, 42 (1968), 69–92).
- Devijver, Hubert, 'De leeftijd van de ridderofficieren tijdens het Vroeg-Romeinse Keizerrijk (Augustus 27 v.C.-Gallienus 268 n.C.)', *Handelingen XXVIII der Koninklijke Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal—en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis* (1974), 83–146.
- Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 2nd edn, London: Macmillan & Co., 1911.
- *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, 2nd edn, London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1933.
- di Salvo, Settimio, *Lex Laetoria: Minore età e crisi sociale tra il III e il II a.C.* (Publicazioni della Facoltà di Giurisprudenza di Camérino, 19), Naples: Jovene, 1979.
- Dixon, Suzanne, *The Roman Mother*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990 (first publ. 1988).
- Dörrie, Heinrich, 'Echo und Narcissus (Ovid, *Met.* 3, 341–510). Psychologische Fiktion in Spiel und Ernst', *Der altsprachliche Unterricht*, 10,1 (1967), 54–75.
- Dorjahn, Alfred P., 'On beginning to write early', *The Classical Journal*, 45 (1949–50), 391–2.
- Dover, Kenneth J., *Greek Homosexuality*, London: Duckworth, 1978.
- Drabkin, I.E., 'On medical education in Greece and Rome', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 15 (1944), 333–51.
- Duckworth, George E., *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- 'The significance of Nisus and Euryalus for *Aeneid IX–XII*', *American Journal of Philology*, 88 (1967), 129–50.
- Duff, J. Wight, *Roman Satire: Its Outlook on Social Life* (Sather Classical Lectures, 12) (diss.) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936.
- *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age from Tiberius to Hadrian*, 3rd edn, London: Benn, 1968.
- Dugas, Ludovic, *L'Amitié antique d'après les mœurs populaires et les theories des philosophes* (History of Ideas in Ancient Greece), 2nd edn, New York: Arno Press, 1976 (first publ. Paris, 1914).
- Dumézil, Georges, 'Jeunesse, éternité, aube: linguistique comparée et mythologie comparée indo-européennes', *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale*, 10 (1938), 289–301.
- Dupont, Florence, 'La psychologie des *adulescentes* dans l'action du *Phormion* de Terence', *Revue des études latines*, 64 (1986), 59–71.
- Durry, Marcel, 'Sur le mariage romain: autocritique et mise au point', *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité*, 3 (1956), 227–43.

- Dyroff, Adolf, *Der Peripatos über das Greisenalter* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, 21, 3), Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1939.
- Egger, R., 'Eine Darstellung des *lusus iuvenalis*', *Jahresberichte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien*, 18 (1915), 115–29.
- Eggersdorfer, Franz X., *Der heilige Augustinus als Pädagoge und seine Bedeutung für die Geschichte der Bildung* (Strassburger Theologische Studien, 8, 3–4), Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1907.
- Eichholz, D.E., 'Galen and his environment', *Greece and Rome*, 20 (1951), 60–71.
- Elder, John P., 'Tibullus: *tersus atque elegans*', in *Elegy and Lyric*, ed. John P. Sullivan, 2nd edn, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965, pp. 65–105.
- Eyben, Emiel, 'Les parents romains soucieux de l'instruction scolaire de leurs fils', *Studia Hellenistica*, 16 (*Antidorum W. Peremans sexagenario ab alumnis oblatum*) (1968), 39–60.
- 'Heracles aan de tweesprong', *Historische documentatie*, 13, 1 (1970), 1–20.
- 'Das Denken des jungen Römers und sein Suchen nach Identität', *Ancient Society*, 2 (1971), 77–104.
- 'The concrete ideal in the life of the young Roman', *L'antiquité classique*, 41 (1972a), 200–17.
- 'Antiquity's view of puberty', *Latomus*, 31 (1972b), 677–97.
- 'Youth and politics during the Roman Republic', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 50 (1972c), 44–69.
- 'Roman notes on the course of life', in *Ancient Society*, 4 (1973), 213–38.
- 'Die Einteilung des menschlichen Lebens im römischen Altertum', *Rheinisches Museum*, 116 (1973), 150–90.
- *De jonge Romein volgens de literaire bronnen der periode ca. 200 v. Chr. tot ca. 500 n. Chr.*, with an English summary (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren, 39, 81), Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1977.
- 'Family planning in Graeco-Roman antiquity', *Ancient Society*, 11–12 (1980–1), 5–82.
- 'Was the Roman "youth" an "adult" socially?', *L'antiquité classique*, 50 (1981a), 328–50.
- 'Bestond er dan echt geen Romeinse jeugd?', *Lampas*, 14 (1981b), 133–40.
- '*Iuvenes et equites* dans la Rome ancienne', *L'antiquité classique*, 51 (1982), 265–77.
- 'Johannes Chrysostomus' tweestrijd tussen jeugdvriendschap, moederliefde en priesterschap: *De sacerdotio* 1, 1, 1—I, 3, 32,

- inleiding, vertaling en commentaar', *Digo. Didactiek in het geschiedenisonderwijs*, 7 (1984), 115–19.
- 'Geschlechtsreife und Ehe im griechisch-römischen Altertum und im frühen Christentum', in *Geschlechtsreife und Legitimation zur Zeugung*, hrsg. von Ernst Wilhelm Müller (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für historische Anthropologie e.V., 3, Kind Jugend Familie, 1), Freiburg and Munich: Karl Alber, 1985, pp. 403–78.
- 'Sozialgeschichte des Kindes im römischen Altertum', in *Zur Sozialgeschichte der Kindheit*, hrsg. von Jochen Martin und August Nitschke (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für historische Anthropologie e.V., 4, Kind Jugend Familie, 2), Freiburg and Munich: Karl Alber, 1986, pp. 317–63.
- 'What did youth mean to the Romans?', in *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 14 (1987), 207–32.
- *De onstuimigen: Jeugd en (on)deugd in het Oude Rome*, Kapellen and Kampen: Pelckmans-Kok Agora, 1987.
- 'Old age in Greco-Roman antiquity and early Christianity: an annotated select bibliography', in *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature*, ed. Thomas M. Falkner and Judith de Luce (Sunny Series in Classical Studies), Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989, pp. 230–51.
- 'Vrouwen van nu en toen in de geschiedschrijving van en over de Grieks-Romeinse Oudheid', *Handelingen van de Koninklijke Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis*, 43 (1989), 225–55.
- 'Youthful (mis)behaviour in Roman antiquity', in *History of Juvenile Delinquency: A Collection of Essays on Crime Committed by Young Offenders, in History and in Selected Countries*, ed. by Albert G. Hess and Priscilla F. Clement, Aalen: Scientia, 1990, pp. 127–205.
- 'Fathers and sons', in *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, ed. Beryl Rawson, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 114–43.
- and Wouters, Alfons, 'Scipio ontmoet Polybius: Polybius, XXXI, 23 e.v. Tekst, vertaling en commentaar', *Lampas*, 10 (1977), 90–119.
- Fantham, Elaine, 'Hautontimorumenos and Adelphoe: a study of fatherhood in Terence and Menander', *Latomus*, 30 (1971), 970–98.
- Faure, Dominique, *L'Éducation selon Plutarque d'après les 'Oeuvres morales'* (Travaux et Mémoires de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Aix en Provence, 13), Aix-en-Provence: La Pensée Universitaire, 1960.
- Feldmann, E., *Der Einfluss des 'Hortensius' und des Mainichäismus auf das Denken des jungen Augustinus* (diss.) Münster: Aschendorf, 1976.
- 'Christus-Frömmigkeit der Mani-Jünger: Der suchende Student Augustinus in ihrem "Netz"', in *Pietas. Festschrift für Bernhard*

- Kötting, hrsg. von Ernst Dassmann und K.Suso Frank (*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, Ergänzungsband, 8), Münster: Aschendorf, 1980, pp. 198–216.
- Ferguson, John, 'The renunciation poems of Catullus', *Greece and Rome*, N.S. 3 (1956), 52–8.
- 'Catullus and Cicero', *Latomus*, 25 (1966), 871–2.
- *Catullus* (Greece and Rome. New Surveys in the Classics, 20), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Ferrari, Leo C., 'The pear-theft in Augustine's *Confessions*', *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 16 (1970), 233–42.
- 'Augustine's "nine years" as a Manichee', *Augustiniana*, 25 (1975), 210–16.
- Festugière, André-Jean, *Personal Religion among the Greeks* (Sather Classical Lectures, 26), Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954.
- 'Julien a Macellum', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 47 (1957), 53–8.
- *Antioche païenne et chrétienne: Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie, avec un commentaire archéologique sur l'Antiochikos (196 ss.) par Roland Martin* (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 194), Paris: de Boccard, 1959.
- *La Vie spirituelle en Grèce à l'époque hellénistique ou: Les besoins de l'esprit dans un monde raffiné* (Empreinte, 1), Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1977.
- Finley, Moses I., and Pleket, Harry W., *The Olympic Games: The First Thousand Years*, New York: Viking, 1976.
- Fiske, Adèle M., 'Hieronymus Ciceronianus', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 96 (1965), 119–38.
- Fitzgerald, G.J., 'Nisus and Euryalus: a paradigm of futile behaviour and the tragedy of youth', in *Cicero and Virgil: Studies in Honour of H. Hunt*, ed. John R.C. Martyn, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1972, pp. 114–37.
- Fitzgerald, William, 'Lucretius' cure for love in the *De rerum natura*', *Classical World*, 78 (1984–5), 73–86.
- Fleury, Edouard, *Hellénisme et christianisme: Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et son temps* (Etudes de théologie historique), Paris: Beauchesne, 1930.
- Flury, Peter, *Liebe und Liebessprache bei Menander, Plautus und Terenz* (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, N.F., 2. Reihe, 25), Heidelberg: Winter, 1968.
- Forbes, Clarence A., 'Ancient universities and student life', *The Classical Journal*, 28 (1932–3), 413–26.

- *Neoi: A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations* (Philological Monographs Published by the American Philological Association, 2), Middletown, Conn.: The American Philological Association, 1933.
- Forsyth, Phyllis Y., 'Generational conflict in Persius', *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Stephen Bertman, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976, pp. 211–20.
- Foucault, Michel, *Histoire de la sexualité*, 3 vols, Paris: Gallimard, 1976–84.
- Fowler, W. Warde, 'On the *toga praetexta* of Roman children', *The Classical Review*, 10 (1896), 317–19.
- Fraccaro, Plinio, 'I *decem stipendia* e le *leges annales* repubblicane', in *Opuscula*, 2. *Studi sull'età della rivoluzione romana: Scritti di diritto pubblico*, Pavia: Athenaeum, 1957, pp. 207–34 (first publ. 1934).
- Fränkel, Eduard, 'Lucan als Mittler des antiken Pathos', in *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg 1924–1925*, Leipzig, 1927, pp. 229–57.
- 'Das Reifen der horazischen Satire', in *Festschrift Erich Reitzenstein*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1931.
- 'Catulls Trostgedicht für Calvus', in *Antike Lyrik*, hrsg. von W. Eisenhut, Darmstadt, 1970, pp. 109–19 (first publ. in *Wiener Studien*, 69 (1956), 278–88).
- Fränkel, Hermann, *Ovid: Ein Dichter zwischen zwei Welten*, transl. K. Nicolai, 3rd edn, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.
- Frank, Richard I., 'Catullus 51: *otium* versus *virtus*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 99 (1968), 233–9.
- Frank, Tenney, 'Cicero and the *poetae novi*', *American Journal of Philology*, 40 (1919), 396–415.
- 'Vergil's apprenticeship. I–III', *Classical Philology*, 15 (1920), 23–38, 103–19, 230–44.
- *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic* (The Sather Classical Lectures, 7), 6th edn, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.
- Friedländer, Ludwig, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von Augustus bis zum Ausgang der Antonine*, 4 vols, 10th edn, Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1921–3.
- Friedländer, Paul, 'Socrates enters Rome', *American Journal of Philology*, 66 (1945), 337–51.
- Fusillo, Massimo, *Il romanzo greco: Polifonia ed Eros (Saggi)*, Venice: Marsilio, 1989.
- Gagé, Jean, 'Classes d'âge: Rites et vêtements de passage dans l'ancien Latium. A propos de la garde-robe du roi Servius Tullius et de la déesse Fortuna', *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie*, 24 (1958), 34–64.

- Gallay, Paul, *La Vie de saint Grégoire de Nazianze* (diss.), Lyon: E. Vitte, 1943.
- Galsterer, Hartmut, 'Spiele und "Spiele": Die Organisation der *ludi iuvenales* in der Kaiserzeit', *Athenaeum*, N.S. 59 (1981), 410–38.
- Gardiner, E. Norman, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Gardner, Jane F., *Women in Roman Law and Society*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- and Wiedemann, Thomas E. J., *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook*, London and New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Garland, Robert, *The Greek Way of Life from Conception to Old Age*, London: Duckworth, 1990.
- Garnsey, Peter, 'Aspects of the decline of the urban aristocracy in the Empire', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2, 1 (1974), 229–59.
- Geffcken, Johannes, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek, 6), Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1929.
- Gilbert, Pierre, and Renard, Marcel, 'Les dates de naissance et de mort de Catulle', *L'antiquité classique*, 11 (1942), 93–6.
- Gilliam, J. F., 'A student at Berytus in an inscription from Pamphylia', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 13 (1974), 147–50.
- Ginestet, Pierre, *Les Organisations de la jeunesse dans l'Occident romain* (Collection Latomus, 213), Brussels: Latomus, 1991.
- Giuliano, Luca, *Gioventù e istituzioni nella Roma antica: Condizione giovanile e processi di socializzazione*, pref. di V. Castellano, Rome: Artistica, 1979.
- Gnilka, Christian, *Aetas spiritalis: Die Überwindung der natürlichen Altersstufen als Ideal frühchristlichen Lebens* (*Theophaneia: Beiträge zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums*, 24), Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1972.
- 'Neues Alter, neues Leben: Eine antike Weisheit und ihre christliche Nutzung', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 20 (1977), 5–38.
- 'Greisenalter', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 12 (1983), cols. 995–1094.
- Golden, Mark, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Ancient Society and History), Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- Gordon, M. L., 'The freedman's son in municipal life', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 21 (1931), 65–77.
- Granarolo, Jean, 'Catulle et César', *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines d'Aix. Série classique*, 32 (1958), 53–73.
- 'La jeunesse au siècle de César d'après Catulle et Cicéron', *Actes du VI^e congrès de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (Lyon, 1958), 1960, 483–519.

- *L'Oeuvre de Catulle: Aspects religieux, éthiques et stylistiques* (Collection d'études anciennes), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967.
- 'Catulle, poète de la contestation juvénile', *Revue de la Francoancienne*, 161 (1968), 597–610.
- *Catulle, ce vivant*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1982.
- Greenhalgh, Peter A.L., *Pompey, the Roman Alexander*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1980.
- Griffin, Jasper, 'Augustan poetry and the life of luxury', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 66 (1976), 87–105.
- 'Genre and real life in Latin poetry', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 71 (1981), 39–49.
- Grimal, Pierre, *L'Amour à Rome*, Paris: Hachette, 1963.
- *Essai sur l'Art poétique d'Horace*, Paris: Sedes, 1968.
- Gross, Nicolas P., *Amatory Persuasion in Antiquity: Studies in Theory and Practice*, Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1985.
- Gross, Walter H., 'Bildungsreisen in der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Der Mensch in seiner Umwelt*, hrsg. von Eckart Olshausen (Humanistische Bildung, 6), Stuttgart: Historisches Institut der Universität, 1983, pp. 47–84.
- Gwynn, Aubrey, *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
- Hägg, Tomas, *The Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Haffter, Heinz, *Terenz und seine künstlerische Eigenart* (Libelli, 243), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967 (first publ. in *Museum Helveticum*, 10 (1953), 1–20, 73–102).
- Hallett, Judith P., 'The role of women in Roman elegy: counter-cultural feminism', *Arethusa*, 6 (1973), 103–24.
- Halperin, David M., *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality, and Other Essays on Greek Love*, New York and London: Routledge, 1990.
- Harcum, Cornelia G., 'The ages of man: a study suggested by Horace, *Ars Poetica*, lines 153–178', *The Classical World*, 7 (1914), 114–18.
- Harmand, Jacques, *L'Armée et le soldat à Rome de 107 à 50 avant notre ère*, Paris: A. et J. Picard et Cie., 1967.
- Harmon, Daniel P., 'The family festivals of Rome', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 11, 16, 2 (1978), 1592–1603.
- Harrent, Albert, *Les Ecoles d'Antioche: Essai sur le savoir et l'enseignement en Orient au IV^e siècle (après J.-C.)*, Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1898.
- Harris, H.A., *Sport in Greece and Rome* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life), 3rd edn, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976.
- *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, 2nd edn, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979.

- Harris, William V., 'The Roman father's power of life and death', *Studies in Roman Law in Memory of A. Arthur Schiller*, ed. Roger S. Bagnall and William V. Harris, Leiden: Brill, 1985, pp. 81–95.
- Harrison, Edward L., 'Horace's tribute to his father', *Classical Philology*, 60 (1965), 111–14.
- Hartke, Werner, *Römische Kinderkaiser: Eine Strukturanalyse römischen Denkens und Daseins*, Darmstadt and Berlin: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972 (first publ. 1951).
- Havelock, Eric A., *The Lyric Genius of Catullus*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1939.
- Heck, E., 'Iuventa—iuventas—iuventus in der römischen Dichtung', in *Silvae. Festschrift für E. Zinn*, ed. M. von Albrecht and E. Heck, Tübingen, 1970, pp. 65–74.
- Hermans, Lex, 'Pederasten en passieven: Homoseksuele identiteit en mannenliefde in het Romeinse rijk. Van de late republiek tot de triomf van het christendom' (unpub. diss., Leiden, 1990).
- Herrero, Victor J., 'Plinio el Joven, educador y pedagogo', *Estudios clásicos*, 5 (1959), 2–20.
- Herter, Hans, 'Dirne', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 3 (1957), cols. 1149–1213.
- 'Effeminatus', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 4 (1959), cols. 620–50.
- 'Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 3 (1960), 70–111.
- Herzog, Rudolf, 'Urkunden zur Hochschulpolitik der römischen Kaiser', *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1935), 967–1019.
- Hewitt, Joseph W., 'Gratitude to parents in Greek and Roman literature', *American Journal of Philology*, 52 (1931), 30–48.
- Hey, Oskar, 'Iuventus (Iuventas)—Iuventa. Iuventa, eine Ersatzbildung', *Jahrbuch für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 18 (1892), 176–87.
- Hightet, Gilbert, 'Libertino patre natus', *American Journal of Philology*, 94 (1973), 268–81.
- Hijmans, Ben L., Jr, 'Askêsis': *Notes on Epictetus' Educational System* (Wijsgerige teksten en studies, 2), Assen: Van Gorcum en Co., 1959.
- Hoffmann, E., 'Aristoteles' Philosophie der Freundschaft', in *Festgabe für Heinrich Rickert*, hrsg. von A. Faust, Buhl and Baden, 1933, pp. 8–36.
- Hogger, Joseph, *Die Kinderpsychologie Augustins* (Deutsches Institut für Wissenschaftliche Pädagogik. Beiträge zur Erziehungswissenschaft, 4), Munich: Kösel-Pustet, 1937.
- Holleman, Aloysius W. J., *Pope Gelasius I and the Lupercalia* (diss.), Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1974.
- Holzberg, Niklas, *Die römische Liebeslegie: Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990.

- Hopfner, Theodor, *Das Sexualleben der Griechen und Römer von den Anfängen bis ins 6. Jahrhundert nach Christus*, Prague: Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1938.
- Hopkins, M.Keith, 'The age of Roman girls at marriage', *Population Studies*, 18 (1965), 309–27.
- Howie, George, *Educational Theory and Practice in St Augustine*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Hubaux, Jean, *Les Themes bucoliques dans la poésie latine*, Brussels: Lamertin, 1930.
- Hug, August, 'Spiele', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 3A, 2 (1929), cols. 1762–74.
- Huizinga, Johan, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Ilberg, Johannes, 'Aus Galens Praxis: Ein Kulturbild aus der römischen Kaiserzeit', in *Antike Medizin*, hrsg. von H.Flashar, Darmstadt, 1971, pp. 361–416 (first publ. in *Neue Jahrbücher*, 15 (1905), 276–312).
- Jaczynowska, Maria, *Les Associations de la jeunesse romaine sous le Haut-Empire* (Polska akademia nauk. Archiwum Filologiczne, 36), Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolinskich Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii, 1978.
- Jensen, R.C., 'Otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est', *The Classical World*, 62 (1967), 363–5.
- Johann, Horst-Theodor, *Erziehung und Bildung in der heidnischen und christlichen Antike* (Wege der Forschung, 377), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976.
- Johne, Renate, 'Zur Figurencharakteristik im antiken Roman', in *Der antike Roman. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte*, hrsg. von Heinrich Kuhn, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1989, pp. 150–77.
- Johns, Catherine, *Sex or Symbol: Erotic Images of Greece and Rome*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990 (first publ. London: British Museum Publications, 1982).
- Johnston, Mary, 'Pliny and the spirit of youth: again', *The Classical Weekly*, 17, 11 (1923–4), 88.
- Jones, Arnold H.M., *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*, 3 vols., Oxford: Blackwell, 1964.
- Jullian, Camille, 'Iuvenes', in *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les documents*, 3 (1900), pp. 782–5.
- Kalinka, E., 'Wahrheit und Dichtung in der römischen Liebeslegie', *Wiener Studien*, 48 (1930), 61–70.
- Karras, Margret, and Wiesehöfer, Josef, *Kindheit und Jugend in der Antike: Eine Bibliographie*, Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1981.

- Kaser, Max, *Das römische Privatrecht* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 10, 3, 3), 2 vols., 2nd edn, Munich: Beck, 1971–5.
- Keaveney, Arthur, 'Young Pompey: 106–79 BC', *L'antiquité classique*, 51 (1982), 111–39.
- Kennedy, George, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 Bc–300 AD* (A History of Rhetoric, 2), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Kenney, Edward J., 'Ovid', in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd edn, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970, pp. 763–5.
- Khan, H. Akbar, 'Catullus 45: what sort of irony?', *Latomus*, 27 (1968), 3–12.
- Kiefer, Otto, *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*, New York: AMS Press, 1975 (first publ. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1934).
- Kleijwegt, Marc, *Ancient Youth: The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society* (diss. Leiden), Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1991.
- Kleve, Knut, 'Lucrèce, l' épicurisme et l'amour', *Actes du VIIIe congrès de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 1969, 376–83.
- Klingner, Friedrich, 'Ciceros Rede für den Schauspieler Roscius: Eine Episode in der Entwicklung seiner Kunstprosa', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 4 (1953), 1–32.
- 'Virgil: Griechische Einflüsse', in *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur*, hrsg. von Friedrich Klingner, Zurich, 1964, pp. 278–95 (first publ. in *L'Influence grecque sur la poésie latine de Catulle à Ovide*, Geneva: Vandoeuvres, 1956, pp. 131–55).
- 'Catull', in *Römische Geisteswelt*, 5th edn, Munich: Ellermann, 1965a, pp. 218–38.
- 'Dichter und Dichtkunst im alten Rom', in *Römische Geisteswelt*, 5th edn, Munich: Ellermann, 1965b, pp. 160–90.
- 'Gedanken über Horaz', in *Römische Geisteswelt*, 5th edn, Munich: Ellermann, 1965c, pp. 353–75.
- 'Virgil: Wiederentdeckung eines Dichters', in *Römische Geisteswelt*, 5th edn, Munich: Ellermann, 1965d, pp. 239–73.
- *Virgil: Bucolica. Georgica. Aeneis*, Zurich: Artemis, 1967.
- Knapp, Charles, 'Some remarks on Cicero as a student', *The Classical Weekly*, 22, 7 (1928), 49–53.
- Knauber, A., 'Das Anliegen der Schule zu Caesarea', *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift*, 19(1968), 182–203.
- Knoche, Ulrich, 'Ein römischer Wurzel lateinischer Persönlichkeitsdichtung', *Neue Jahrbücher für antike und deutsche Bildung*, 3 (1940), 238–52.

- 'Erlebnis und dichterischer Ausdruck in der lateinischen Poesie', *Museum Helveticum*, 65 (1958), 146–65.
- *Die römische Satire* (Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft, 5), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971 (first publ. Berlin, 1949).
- Kodrebski, Jan, 'Der Rechtsunterricht am Ausgang der Republik und zu Beginn des Prinzipats', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2, 15 (1976), 177–96.
- Kollesch, Jutta, 'Ärztliche Ausbildung in der Antike', *Klio*, 61 (1979), 507–13.
- Komp, Marion, *Absage an Cynthia: Das Liebesthema beim späten Properz* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, 15, Klassische Sprachen und Literaturen, 40), Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988.
- Konstan, David, 'Love in the Greek novel', *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 2, 1 (1990), 186–205.
- Koopmans, Jakob H., *Augustinus' briefwisseling met Dioscorus. Inleiding, tekst, vertaling, commentaar* (diss.), Amsterdam: Jasonpers, 1949.
- Kosthorst, Alfred, 'Die Frauen- und Jünglingsgestalten in Vergils Aeneis' (unpubl. diss., Münster, 1934).
- Krenkel, Werner A., 'Zur Biographie des Lucilius', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 1, 2 (1972), 1240–59.
- 'Skopophilie in der Antike', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 26 (1977a), 619–31.
- 'Exhibitionismus in der Antike', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 26 (1977b), 613–18.
- 'Männliche Prostitution in der Antike', *Das Altertum*, 24 (1978a), 49–55.
- 'Der Sexualtrieb: seine Bewertung in Griechenland und Rom', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 27 (1978b), 165–80.
- 'Pueri meritorii', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 28 (1979a), 179–80.
- 'Masturbation in der Antike', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 28 (1979b), 159–78.
- 'Sex und politische Biographie', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 29 (1980a), 65–76.
- 'Fellatio and irrumatio', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 29 (1980b), 77–88.

- 'Tonguing', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 30 (1981), 37–54.
- 'Libido im Griechischen und Lateinischen', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 31 (1982), 39–44.
- 'Prostitution', in *Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean: Greece and Rome*, ed. Michael Grant and Rachel Kitzinger, Vol. 2, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1988a, pp. 1291–7.
- 'Pueri meritorii Romani', in *Soziale Randgruppen und Aussenseiter im Altertum*, hrsg. von Ingomar Weiler und Herbert Grassl, Graz: Leykam, 1988b, pp. 191–200.
- Kriekemans, Albert J.J., *Geschiedenis van de jeugdpsychologie* (Genetische psychologie. Systematisch en historisch, 12), Tiel and The Hague: Lannoo, 1967.
- Kroll, Wilhelm, 'Knabenliebe', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 11, 1 (1921), cols. 897–906.
- *Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit*, mit einem Vorwort von Reinhard Herbig, Leipzig: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963 (first publ. in 2 vols, 1933).
- 'Römische Erotik', in *Sexualität und Erotik in der Antike*, hrsg. von Andreas Karsten Siems (Wege der Forschung, 605), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988, pp. 70–117 (first publ. in *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft*, 17 (1930), 145–78).
- Kühler, Bernhard, 'Decurio', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 4, 2 (1901), cols. 2319–52.
- 'Rechtsunterricht', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 1 A 1 (1914), cols. 394–405.
- 'Magistratus', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 14, 1 (1928), cols. 400–37.
- 'Munus', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 16, 1 (1933), cols. 644–51.
- Kugener, M.-A., 'Les brimades aux IV^e et V^e siècles de notre ère', *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles*, 10 (1904–5), 345–56.
- Kunderewicz, Cezar, 'Le gouvernement et les étudiants dans le code Théodosien', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 50 (1972), 577–88.
- Lacey, W.K., 'Patria potestas', in *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, ed. Beryl Rawson, London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1986, pp. 121–44.
- Ladage, Dieter, 'Collegia iuvenum—Ausbildung einer Municipalen Elite?', *Chiron*, 9 (1979), 319–46.
- Lagrange, M.-J., 'Marc Aurèle. Le jeune homme. Le philosophe. L'empereur', *Revue biblique*, 10 (1913), 243–59, 394–410, 568–87.

- Laistner, Max L.W., *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire: Together with an English translation of John Chrysostom's 'Address on Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring up their Children'*, 2nd edn, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Lambert, Garth R., *Rhetoric Rampant: The Family under Siege in the Early Western Tradition*, Ontario: The University of Western Ontario, 1982.
- Lambert, Royston, *Beloved and God: The Story of Hadrian and Antinous*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1984.
- Lambrechts, Pieter, 'Het begrip "jeugd" in de politieke en godsdienstige hervormingen van Augustus', *L'antiquité classique*, 17 (1948), 355–71.
- Lammert, Friedrich, 'Tiro', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 6 A 2 (1937), cols. 1448–50.
- Lans, F., 'Des hl. Augustins Jugendfreundschaften', in *Der Fels*, 24 (1930), 250–64.
- La Penna, Antonio, *L'integrazione difficile: Un profilo di Propertio* (Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi. Filologia. Linguistica. Critica letteraria, 297), Turin: Einaudi, 1977.
- Laughton, E., 'Disertissime Romuli nepotes', *Classical Philology*, 65 (1970), 1–7.
- Lawler, Lillian B., 'Two portraits from Tertullian', *The Classical Journal*, 25 (1929–30), 19–23.
- Leach, Eleanor W., 'Horace's *Pater Optimus* and Terence's Demea: Autobiographical Fiction and Comedy in *Sermo*, I, 4', *The American Journal of Philology*, 92 (1971), 616–32.
- Lee, D. Russell, 'Child-life, adolescence and marriage in Greek New Comedy and in the comedies of Plautus' (unpubl. diss., Madison, Wis., 1919).
- Leeman, Anton D., *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers*, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963.
- 'Catullus, angry young man', *Hermeneus*, 35 (1963–4), 101–14.
- Léglise, S., 'Saint Ennodius et la haute éducation littéraire dans le monde romain au commencement du VI^e siècle', *L'université catholique*, N.S. 5 (1890), 209–28, 375–97, 568–90.
- Légrand, Philippe-Ernest, *Daos: Tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle (Annales de l'Université de Lyon. N.S., 2, Droit. Lettres, 26)*, Lyon and Paris: A. Hey—A. Fontainoigne, 1910.
- Leonhard, A., 'Aetas', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 1, 1 (1893), cols. 692–4.
- Levin, Donald N., 'War and peace in early Roman elegy', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2, 30, 1 (1982), 418–538.
- Levy, D., 'Licentius', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 13, 1 (1926), cols. 204–10.

- Lieberg, Godo, *Puella divina. Die Gestalt der göttlichen Geliebten bei Catull im Zusammenhang der antiken Dichtung*, Amsterdam: Schippers, 1962.
- 'Die Mythologie des Properz in der Forschung und die Idealisierung Cynthias', *Rheinisches Museum*, 112 (1969), 311–47.
- Liebs, Detlef, 'Rechtsschulen und Rechtsunterricht im Prinzipat', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2, 15 (1976), 197–286.
- Lilja, Saara, *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women* (Garland Library of Latin Poetry), New York: Garland, 1978 (first publ. Helsinki, 1965).
- *Homosexuality in Republican and Augustan Rome* (Commentationes humanarum litterarum, 74), Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1982.
- Lintott, Andrew W., 'The tradition of violence in the annals of the early Roman Republic', *Historia*, 19 (1970), 12–29.
- *Violence in Republican Rome*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972 (first publ. 1968).
- Luck, Georg, *The Latin Love Elegy*, 2nd edn, London: Methuen & Co., 1969.
- Lumpe, A., and Karpp, H., 'Eltern', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 4 (1959), cols. 1190–1219.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M., 'Servitium amoris', *The Classical Quarterly*, N.S. 29 (1979), 117–30.
- *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- McCarthy, John H., 'Octavianus puer', *Classical Philology*, 26 (1931), 362–73.
- McGushin, Patrick, 'Catullus' *sanctae foedus amicitiae*', *Classical Philology*, 62 (1967), 85–93.
- *C. Sallustius Crispus, Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary (Mnemosyne: Bibliotheca classica Batava, Supplementum, 45)*, Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Mackay, L. A., 'Umbrian Rimbaud', *Greece and Rome*, 17 (1970), 177–83.
- Macmullen, Ramsay, *Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire* (Harvard Historical Monographs, 52), Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire*, 2nd edn, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- 'Roman attitudes to Greek love', *Historia*, 31 (1982), 484–502.
- McNamara, Marie A., *Friendship in Saint Augustine* (Studia Friburgensia, N.S. 20), Fribourg: University Press, 1958.
- Manfredini, Arrigo, 'L'editto *De coercendis rhetoribus Latinis* del 92 A.C.', *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris*, 42 (1976), 99–148.
- Marcadé, Jean, *Roma Amor: Essai sur les représentations érotiques dans l'art étrusque et romain*, Geneva [etc.]: Les Editions Nagel, 1968.

- Marrou, Henri-Irénée, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, 6th edn, Paris: Seuil, 1965.
- Martin, J.M.K., 'Persius—poet of the Stoics', *Greece and Rome*, 8 (1939), 172–82.
- Martindale, Charles A., 'Paradox, hyperbole, and literary novelty in in Lucan's *De bello civili*', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*, 23 (1976), 45–54.
- Medicus, Dieter, 'Minores', in *Der kleine Pauly*, 3 (1975), cols. 1330–2.
- 'Aetas', in *Der kleine Pauly*, 1 (1975), cols. 103–4.
- Meister, Karl, 'Die Freundschaft bei den Griechen und Römern', in *Römische Wertbegriffe*, hrsg. von Hans Oppermann (Wege der Forschung, 34), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967, pp. 323–9.
- Mench, Fred, 'The conflict of codes in Euripides' *Hippolytus*', in *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Stephen Bertman, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976, pp. 75–88.
- Mette, Hans-Joachim, 'Der junge Zivilanwalt Cicero', *Gymnasium*, 72 (1965), 10–27.
- 'Von der Jugend', *Hermes*, 110 (1982), 257–68.
- Metzger, H., *Jugend der Antike in Urkunden und Briefen*, St Gallen: Ekkehard, 1973.
- Michel, Alain, *Tacite et le destin de l'Empire*, préf. de Pierre Grimal, Paris: Arthaud, 1966.
- Mitchel, Thomas N., *Cicero: The Ascending Years*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Moeller, Walter O., 'The riot of AD 59 at Pompeii', *Historia*, 19 (1970), 84–95.
- Mohler, S.L., 'The *iuvenes* and Roman education', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 68 (1937), 442–79.
- Monceaux, Paul, *Saint Jerome: Sa jeunesse, l'étudiant, l'ermite* (La vie chrétienne, 2, 7), Paris: Grasset, 1932.
- Montero Díaz, Santiago, 'La juventud romana en torno a Catilina', in *Estudios de historia antigua y medieval*, ed. Santiago Montero Díaz, Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1988, pp. 53–102.
- Morel, Jean-Paul, '"Pube praesenti in contione, omni poplo" (Plaute, *Pseudolus*, v. 126): *Pubes* et *contio* d'après Plaute et Tite-Live', *Revue des études latines*, 42 (1964), 375–88.
- 'La *iuentus* et les origines du theatre romain (Tite-Live VII, 2; Valère-Maxime II, 4, 4)', *Revue des études latines*, 47 (1969), 208–52.
- 'Sur quelques aspects de la jeunesse a Rome', in *Mélanges offerts a J. Heurgon: L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine* (Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome, 27), Paris, 1976, pp. 663–83.
- Morford, Mark, *Persius*, Boston: Twayne, 1984.

- Morris, J., '*Leges annales* under the Principate. I: legal and constitutional', *Listy filologické*, 87 (1964), 316-77.
- '*Leges annales* under the Principate. II: political effects', *Listy filologické*, 88 (1965), 22-31.
- Müller, Albert, 'Studentenleben im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.', *Philologus*, N.F. 23 (1910), 292-317.
- Murgatroyd, P., '*Militia amoris* and the Roman elegists', *Latomus*, 34 (1975), 59-79.
- '*Servitium amoris* and the Roman elegists', *Latomus*, 40 (1981), 589-606.
- Musgrove, F., *Youth and the Social Order* (International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction, 343, 9), 2nd edn, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.
- Myerowitz, Molly, *Ovid's Games of Love*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1985.
- Naldini, M., 'Sulla *Oratio ad adolescentes* di Basilio Magno', *Prometheus*, 4 (1978), 36-44.
- Neesen, Ludwig, 'Die Entwicklung der Leistungen und Ämter (*munera et honores*) im römischen Kaiserreich des zweiten bis vierten Jahrhunderts', *Historia*, 30 (1981), 203-35.
- Néraudau, Jean-Pierre, 'L'exploit de Titus Manlius Torquatus (Tite-Live, VII, 9, 6-10): Réflexion sur la *iuventus* archaïque chez Tite-Live', in *Mélanges J. Heurgon*, tome 2, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1976, pp. 685-94.
- '*Sexagenarii de ponte*: réflexions sur la genèse d'un proverbe', *Revue des études latines*, 56 (1978), 159-74.
- *La Jeunesse dans la littérature et les institutions de la Rome républicaine* (Collection d'études anciennes), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979.
- 'Jeunesse et politique à Rome au IV^e siècle avant J.C. (d'après Tite-Live III)', in *Mélanges Pierre Willeumier* (Collection d'études latines. Série scientifique, 35), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1980, pp. 251-60.
- *Etre enfant à Rome* (Realia), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984.
- Nilsson, Martin P., *Die hellenistische Schule*, Munich: C.H. Beck, 1955.
- Nisbet, Robert G.M., 'Persius', in *Satire: Critical Essays on Roman Literature*, ed. J.P. Sullivan, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963, pp. 39-71.
- Nock, Arthur D., 'Conversion and adolescence', in *Pisciculi. Studien zur Religion und Kultur des Altertums Franz Joseph Dölger zum sechzigsten Geburtstage dargeboten* (Antike und Christentum. Ergbd., 1), Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1939, pp. 165-77.
- Nolte, V., *Augustins' Freundschaftsideal in seinen Briefen: Unter Hereinbeziehung seiner Jugendfreundschaften gemäß den*

- philosophischen Schriften und seinen Konfessionen*, Würzburg: Rita-Verlag, 1939.
- Norman, A.F., 'Libanius: the teacher in an age of violence', in *Libanios*, hrsg. von Georgios Fatouros und Tilman Krischer (Wege der Forschung, 621), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983, pp. 150–69.
- Nuyens, Michel, *Le Statut obligatoire des décurions dans le droit constantien*, Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1964.
- Ogilvie, Robert M., *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5*, 2nd edn, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978 (first publ. 1970).
- Oksala, P., 'Fides und pietas bei Catull', *Arctos*, 2 (1958), 88–103.
- Oksala, Teivas, 'Catulls Attis-Ballade: Über den Stil der Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Persönlichkeit des Dichters', *Arctos*, 3 (1962), 199–213.
- Oliver, Revilo P., 'The first edition of the *Amores*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 76 (1945), 191–215.
- Olivová, Vera, *Sports and Games in the Ancient World*, transl. D. Orpington, New York: St Martin's Press, 1985 (first publ. 1984).
- O'Meara, John J., *The Young Augustine: The Growth of St. Augustine's Mind up to his Conversion*, London: Longman, Green & Co., 1954.
- Otto, A., *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörterlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1962 (first publ. Leipzig, 1890).
- Paoli, Ugo E., *Vita Romana*, 10th edn, Florence: Le Monnier, 1972.
- Parks, E. Patrick, *The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a Preparation for the Courts under the Early Empire* (The Johns Hopkins University. Studies in Historical and Political Science, 63, 2), Baltimore, Md: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1945.
- Patzner, Harald, *Die griechische Knabenliebe* (Sitzungsberichte der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J.W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main, 19, 1), Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982.
- Pederson, Fritz S. 'On professional qualifications for public posts in late antiquity', *Classica et medievalia*, 31 (1970), 161–213.
- Pélékidis, Chrysis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (Ecole Française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 13), Paris: Boccard, 1962.
- Pemberton, Robert E.K., 'Advocatus diaboli: a defense of the rhetorical education', *The Classical Journal*, 28 (1932–3), 32–43.
- Pepe, Luigi, 'Si vitam puriter egi: Sul carme 76 di Catullo', *Giornale italiano di filologia*, 3 (1950), 300–9.
- Perelli, Luciano, *Il teatro rivoluzionario di Terenzio* (Biblioteca di cultura, 112), Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1976 (first publ. 1973).
- Perrin, Bernard, 'La responsabilité pénale du mineur de vingt-cinq ans en droit romain', in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à A. Piganiol*, ed. R. Chevalier, tome 3, Paris: Sevrin, 1966, pp. 1455–65.

- Peters, Maria, 'Augustins erste Bekehrung', in *Harnack-Ehrung: Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte*, Leipzig: J.E.Hinrichs, 1921, pp. 195–211.
- Petit, Paul, *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IV^e siècle après J.-C.* (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth, 62), Paris: Geuthner, 1955.
- *Les Etudiants de Libanius: Un professeur de faculté et ses élèves au Bas Empire* (Etudes prosopographiques, 1) (diss.), Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1956.
- Petit de Julleville, Louis, *L'Ecole d'Athènes au IV^e siècle après Jésus-Christ* (diss.), Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1868.
- Pfister, Gertrud, *Die Erneuerung der römischen 'Iuventus' durch Augustus*, Bochum: Sofortdruckerei Studentenschaft, 1977.
- Pfligersdorfer, Georg, 'Lucan als Dichter des geistigen Widerstandes', *Hermes*, 87 (1959), 344–77.
- Pharr, Clyde, 'Roman legal education', *The Classical Journal*, 34 (1939), 257–70.
- Pichon, René, 'L'affaire des *rhetoires latini*', *Revue des études anciennes*, 6 (1904), 37–41.
- Pietquin, Paul, 'Analyse du poème 76 de Catulle', *Les études classiques*, 54 (1986), 351–66.
- Pikhaus, Dorothy, 'Portrait d'une mère par son fils: a propos de l'épithaphe de Turtura (ICUR 6018=ILCV 2142=CLE 2103)', *Studia varia Bruxellensia ad orbem Graeco-Latinum pertinentia*, 2 (1990), 153–76.
- Pinto, M., 'La scuola di Libanio nel quadro del IV secolo dopo Cristo', *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo. Classe di Lettere*, 108 (1974), 146–79.
- Pleket, Harry W., 'Collegium iuvenum Nemesiorum: a note on ancient youth-organisations', *Mnemosyne*, ser. IV, 22 (1969), 281–98.
- 'Zur Soziologie des antiken Sports', *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*, 36 (1974), 57–87.
- 'Games, prizes, athletes and ideology: some aspects of the history of sport in the Greco-Roman world', *Arena*, 1 (1976), 49–89.
- 'Licht uit Leuven over de Romeinse jeugd?', *Lampas*, 12 (1979), 173–92.
- 'Stadstaat en onderwijs in de Griekse wereld', *Lampas*, 14 (1981), 155–78.
- Plesecia, Joseph, 'Patria potestas and the Roman revolution', *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Stephen Bertman, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976, pp. 143–70.
- Pöschl, Viktor, *Die Hirtendichtung Virgils*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1964.
- Poliakoff, Michael B., *Combat Sports in the Ancient World: Competition, Violence, and Culture* (Sport and History Series), New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987.

- Pomeroy, Sarah B., *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*, New York: Schocken Books, 1975.
- Pratt, Kenneth J., 'Roman anti-militarism', *The Classical Journal*, 51 (1955-6), 21-5.
- Quacquarelli, Antonio, *Scuola e cultura dei primi secoli cristiani* (Nuove questioni di storia della pedagogia), Brescia: La Scuola, 1974.
- Quinn, Kenneth, *The Catullan Revolution*, 2nd edn, Cambridge: Heffer, 1969.
- Raditsa, Leo F., 'Augustus' legislation concerning marriage, procreation, love affairs and adultery', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2, 13 (1980), 278-339.
- Rankin, Anne V., 'Hippolytus: a psychopathological hero', *Arethusa*, 7, 1 (1974), 71-94.
- Rawson, Beryl (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1986.
- (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Reekmans, Tony, 'Inhoud en functie van de invectieve in Catullus' epigrammen', *Handelingen van het 29e Vlaams Filologencongres*, 1973, 159-66.
- Reinhold, Meyer, 'The generation gap in antiquity', in *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Stephen Bertman, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976, pp. 15-54 (first publ. in *Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 114 (1970), 347-65).
- Reitzenstein, Erich, *Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz* (*Philologus*, Supplementum, 29, 2), Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936.
- 'Das neue Kunstwollen in den Amores Ovids', in *Ovid*, hrsg. von M. von Albrecht und E. Zinn, Darmstadt, 1968, pp. 206-32 (first publ. in *Rheinisches Museum*, 84 (1935), 62-88).
- Reitzenstein, Richard, 'Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik', *Sitzungsberichte Heidelberg*, 12 (1912), 1-36.
- 'Das foedus in der römischen Erotik', in *Catull*, hrsg. von R. Heine, Darmstadt, 1975, pp. 153-80 (first publ. in *Sitzungsberichte Heidelberg*, 12 (1912), 9-33).
- Renner, R., 'Seneca und die Jugend', *Blätter für das bayerische Gymnasialschulwesen*, 46 (1910), 333-43.
- Richardson, Bessie E., *Old Age among the Ancient Greeks: The Greek Portrayal of Old Age in Literature, Art and Inscriptions. With a Study of the Duration of Life among the Ancient Greeks on the Basis of Inscriptions* (The Johns Hopkins University. Studies in Archaeology, 16), New York: Greenwood Press, 1969 (first publ. 1933).
- Rissom, Hans-Wolf, 'Vater- und Sohnmotive in der römischen Komödie', (unpubl. diss., Kiel, 1971).

- Robbins, Vernon K., *Ancient Quotes and Anecdotes: From Crib to Crypt* (Foundations and Facets. Reference Series), Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1989.
- Robert, Jean-Noël, *Les Plaisirs a Rome* (Collection Réalia), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983.
- Robert, Louis, *Les Gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*, 2nd edn, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971 (first publ. Limoges, 1940).
- Roberti, Melchior, 'Patria potestas e paterna pietas: contributo allo studio dell'influenza del cristianesimo sul diritto Romano', in *Studi in onore di A. Albertoni*, ed. P. Ciapessoni, Vol. 1, Padua: Cedam, 1935, pp. 257–70.
- Rögler, Günther, 'Die Lex Villia Annalis', *Klio*, 40 (1962), 76–123.
- Robinson, Laura, 'Marcus Terentius Varro: *sexagesis* or born sixty years too late', *Atti del congresso internazionale di studi Varroniani*, Vol. 2, Rieti: Centro di Studi Varroniani, 1976, pp. 477–83.
- Rolin, G., 'La personnalité de Cicéron a l'âge de 26 ans (*Pro Quinctio*): Sa pensée sociale et politique', *L'antiquité classique*, 48 (1979), 559–82.
- 'La jeunesse perturbée de M. Tullius Cicéron', *Les études classiques*, 47 (1979), 335–46; 48 (1980), 43–61.
- Romano, Domenico, 'Licenzio poeta: sulla posizione di Agostino verso la poesia', *Nuovo Didaskaleion*, 11 (1961), 1–22.
- Rosati, Gianpiero, 'Narciso o l'illusione dissolta (Ovidio, *Metam.* III 339–510)', *Maia*, 28 (1976), 83–108.
- Rostoftzeff, Michael, 'Römische Bleitesserae: *Tesserae* der städtischen und munizipalen *iuventus*', *Klio*, Beiheft, 3 (1905), 59–93.
- Roussel, Pierre, 'Etude sur le principe de l'ancienneté dans le monde hellénique du Ve siècle av. J.-C. a l'époque romaine', *Monuments et mémoires publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 43 (1951), 123–227.
- Rousselle, Aline, *Porneia: De la maîtrise du corps a la privation sensorielle. IIe-IVe siècles de l'ère chrétienne* (Les Chemins de l'Histoire), Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1983.
- Rubino, Carl A., 'The erotic world of Catullus', *The Classical World*, 68 (1975), 289–98.
- Rudd, Niall, 'The style and the man', *Phoenix*, 18 (1964), 216–31.
- Russell, Donald A., and Winterbottom, Michael, *Classical Literary Criticism* (The World's Classics), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Rutz, Werner (ed.), *Lucan* (Wege der Forschung, 235), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.
- 'Lucan und die Rhetorik', *Lucain. Sept exposes suivis de discussions, entretiens prepares et presides par Marcel Durry*, Vandoeuvres and Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1970, pp. 233–65.

- Sabot, A.-F., *Ovide, poète de l'amour dans ses oeuvres de jeunesse: Amores, Héroides, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris, De Medicamine Faciei Femineae*, Paris: Ophrys, 1976.
- Sachers, E., 'Paterfamilias', *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 18, 4 (1949), cols. 2121–57.
- 'Potestas patria', *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 22, 1 (1953), cols. 1046–1175.
- Saller, Richard P., 'Patria potestas and the stereotype of the Roman family', *Continuity and Change*, 1 (1986), 7–22.
- 'Men's age at marriage and its consequences in the Roman family', *Classical Philology*, 82 (1987), 21–34.
- 'Pietas, obligation and authority in the Roman family', in *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*, Darmstadt, 1988, pp. 393–410.
- Sarton, George, *Galen of Pergamon* (Clendening [Logan] Lectures on the History and Philosophy of Medicine, 3), Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1954.
- Scerbo, G., 'Il furto di Sant' Agostino', in *Nuova rivista pedagogica*, 2 (1952), 29–48.
- Schadewaldt, Wolfgang, 'Sinn und Werden der vergilischen Dichtung', in *Wege zu Vergil*, hrsg. von Hans Oppermann, Darmstadt, 1966, pp. 43–68 (first publ. in *Hellas und Hesperien*, Zurich, 1960, pp. 498–519).
- Schanz, Martin, Hosius, Carl, and Krüger, Gustav, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian* (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 8), 4th edn, 4 vols., Munich: Beck, 1932–5.
- Schemmel, Fritz, 'Der Sophist Libanios als Schüler und Lehrer', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur*, 20 (1907), 52–69.
- 'Die Hochschule von Athen im IV. und V. Jahrhundert p. Ch.', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur*, 22 (1908a), 494–513.
- 'Die Hochschule von Konstantinopel im IV. Jahrhundert p. Ch.', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur*, 22 (1908b), 147–68.
- 'Die Hochschule von Alexandria im IV. und V. Jahrhundert p. Ch.', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur*, 24 (1909), 438–57.
- 'Das Athenaeum in Rom', *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 40 (1920), 7–8, 41 (1921), 982–4.
- 'Die Schule von Berytus', *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 43 (1923), 236–40.
- 'Die Schule von Caesarea in Palästina', *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 45 (1925), 1277–80.

- 'Die Schule von Karthago', *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 47 (1927a), 1342–4.
- 'Basilius und die Schule von Caesarea', *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 47 (1927b), 620–4.
- 'Die Schulzeit des Kaisers Julian', *Philologus*, 82 (1927c), 455–66.
- Schuster, Mauriz, *Tibull-Studien: Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik Tibulls und des Corpus Tibullianum*, Hildesheim: Olms, 1968 (first publ. Wien, 1930).
- Schwarz, Andreas B., 'Die justinianische Reform des Pubertätsbeginns und die Beilegung juristischer Kontroversen', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung*, 69 (1952), 345–87.
- Schäfer, Eckart, *Das Verhältnis von Erlebnis und Kunstgestalt bei Catull* (Hermes. Einzelschriften, 18), Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1966.
- Schönberger, Otto, 'Ein Dichter römischer Freiheit: M. Annaeus Lucanus', in *Lucan*, hrsg. von W. Rutz, Darmstadt, 1970, pp. 525–45 (first publ. in *Das Altertum*, 10 (1964), 26–40).
- Scivoletto, Nino, *Musa iocosa: Studio sulla poesia giovanile di Ovidio* (Biblioteca del giornale italiano di filologia, N.S. 1), Rome: Elia, 1976.
- Scott, William C., 'Catullus and Calvus (Cat. 50)', *Classical Philology*, 64 (1969), 169–73.
- Scullard, Howard H., *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life), London: Thames & Hudson, 1970.
- *Roman Politics (220–150 BC)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Seel, Otto, 'Generationskrise', in *Cicero: Wort, Staat, Welt*, 3rd edn, Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1967, pp. 261–326, 490–3.
- Segal, Charles P., 'Catullus 5 and 7: a study in complementaries', *American Journal of Philology*, 89 (1968), 284–301.
- 'Catullan otiosi: the lover and the poet', *Greece and Rome*, N.S. 17 (1970), 25–31.
- Segal, Erich, 'O tempora o mos maiorum!', in *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Stephen Bertman, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976, pp. 135–42.
- Seitz, Konrad, 'Der pathetische Erzählstil Lucans', *Hermes*, 93 (1965), 204–32.
- Senay, Pierre, 'Les épodes XVI et VII: premiers manifestes politiques d'Horace', in *Mélanges Etienne Gareau*, Ottawa: Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1982, pp. 153–7.
- Shaw, Brent D., 'The age of Roman girls at marriage: some reconsiderations', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 77 (1987), 30–46.
- Shelton, Jo-Ann, *As the Romans Did: A Source Book in Roman Social History*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Siems, Andreas K. (ed.), *Sexualität und Erotik in der Antike* (Wege der Forschung, 605), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988.

- Sirago, Vito A., *Catullo, poeta della giovinezza*, con pref. di Francesco Arnaldin, Arona: Paideia, 1947.
- Sluanski, Dan, 'Varron et les *gradus aetatum*', *Analele Universitatii Bucuresti. Limbi clasice si orientale*, 22 (1973), 103-9.
- 'Le vocabulaire latin des *gradus aetatum*', *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 19 (1974), 103-21, 267-96, 345-69, 437-51, 563-78.
- Small, Stuart G.P., *Catullus: A Reader's Guide to the Poems*, Lanham: University Press of America, 1983.
- Smoot, Jean J., 'Hippolytus as Narcissus: an amplification', *Arethusa*, 9 (1976), 37-51.
- Snell, Bruno, 'Die 16. Epode von Horaz und Vergils 4. Ekloge', *Hermes*, 73 (1938), 237-42.
- *Die Entdeckung des Geistes: Studien zur Entstehung europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen*, 3rd edn, Hamburg: Claassen, 1955.
- Solazzi, Siro, *La minora età nel diritto romano*, Rome: Athenaeum, 1912.
- Solodow, Joseph B., 'Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: the lover as cultural ideal', *Wiener Studien*, N.F. 11 (1977), 106-27.
- Souilhé, Joseph (ed. & transl.), *Epictetus, Entretiens* (Collection des Universités de France), 4 vols, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943-65.
- Spies, Alfons, 'Militat omnis amans': *Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik* (Garland Library of Latin Poetry), New York: Garland, 1978 (first publ. as diss., Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1930).
- Stahl, Hans-Peter, *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War'. Individual and State under Augustus*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Steidle, Wolf, 'Das Motiv der Lebenswahl bei Tibull und Properz (Erich Burck zum 60. Geburtstag [30. XI. 1961])', *Wiener Studien*, 75 (1962), 100-40.
- Stein, Albert, 'Platons Charakteristik der menschlichen Altersstufen' (unpubl. diss., Bonn, 1966).
- Stinchcomb, James, 'The two younger Tullii', *The Classical Journal*, 28 (1932-3), 441-8.
- Stoessl Franz, 'Catull als Epigrammatiker', in *Das Epigramm*, hrsg. von G. Pfohl, Darmstadt, 1969, pp. 137-52 (first publ. in *Wiener Studien*, 70 (1957), 290-305).
- *C. Valerius Catullus: Mensch, Leben, Dichtung* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 85), Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1977.
- Strathmann, H., 'Attis', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 1 (1950), cols. 889-99.
- Strathmann, H. and Keseling, P., 'Askese', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 1 (1950), cols. 749-95.
- Stroux, Johannes, and Wenger, Leopold, *Die Augustus-Inschrift auf dem Marktplatz von Kyrene* (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische und Historische Klasse, 34, 1), Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1928.

- Suder, Wieslaw, 'On age classification in Roman Imperial literature', *The Classical Bulletin*, 55 (1978), 5–9.
- *Census Populi: Bibliographie de la démographie de l'antiquité romaine*, Bonn: Dr Rudolf Habelt, 1988.
- *Geras: Old Age in Greco-Roman Antiquity. A Classified Bibliography*, Wrocław, 1991.
- Suolahti, Jaakko, *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period: A Study in Social Structure* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, B, 97), Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1955.
- Surmud, Heinz-Georg, 'Factus eram ipse mihi magna quaestio' (Confessiones IV 4). Untersuchungen zu Erfahrung und Deutung des Todes bei Augustinus, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Problems der *mors immatura*' (unpubl. diss., Münster, 1978).
- Syme, Ronald, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford Paperbacks, 1), 3rd edn, London: Oxford University Press, 1966 (first publ. 1956).
- 'Marriage ages for Roman senators', *Historia*, 36 (1987), 318–32.
- Szemler, Georg J., *The Priests of the Roman Republic: A Study of Interactions between Priesthoods and Magistracies* (Latomus, 127), Brussels: Latomus, 1972.
- Taladoire, Barthélémy-Antonin, *Terence: Un théâtre de la jeunesse* (Collection d'études anciennes), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1972.
- Tanzer, Helen H., *The Common People of Pompeii: A Study of the Graffiti* (Studies in Archaeology of the Johns Hopkins University, 29), Baltimore, Md: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1939.
- Tescari, Onorato, 'Verità e fantasia nella vita di S. Agostino anteriormente alla sua conversione', in *Augustiniana. Napoli a S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della nascita*, Naples: Istituto Editoriale del Mezzogiorno, 1955, pp. 63–78.
- Testard, Maurice, 'Le fils de Cicéron destinaire du *De officiis*', *Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé*, 2 (1969), 198–213.
- Thierfelder, Andreas, 'Der Dichter Lucan', in *Lucan*, hrsg. von W. Rutz (Wege der Forschung, 235), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970, pp. 50–69 (first publ. in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 25 (1934), 1–20).
- Thomas, J.A.C., 'Delictal and criminal liability of the young in Roman law', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des institutions*, 38 (1977), 9–31.
- Thomas, Yan, 'Droit domestique et droit politique à Rome: Remarques sur le pécule et les honores des fils de famille', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome*, 94 (1982), 527–80.
- 'Vitae necisque potestas: le père, la cité, la mort', in *Du Châtiment dans la cité: Supplices corporels et peine de mort dans le*

- monde antique* (Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome), Paris, 1984, pp. 499–548.
- Toliver, Hazel M., 'The Terentian doctrine of education', *The Classical Weekly*, 43 (1950), 195–200.
- Treloar, A., 'Libanius and unrest among the pupils', *Prudentia*, 5, 1 (1973), 51–67.
- van Bavel, Tarsicius J., *Augustinus: Van liefde en vriendschap* (Theologische Monografieën), Baarn: Het Wereldvenster, 1970.
- van Berchem, Denis, 'Cynthia ou la carrière contrariée: essai sur la condition sociale des poètes latins', *Museum Helveticum*, 5 (1948), 137–54.
- van den Bergh, Jan H., *Metabologica, of leer der veranderingen: Beginselen van een historische psychologie*, Nijkerk: G.F. Callenbach, 1956.
- van den Bruwaene, Martin, 'Cicéron éducateur de ses enfants', *Nova et vetera*, 14 (1932), 461–9; 15 (1933), 53–63.
- 'Cicero's leerjaar op Rhodos', *Hermeneus*, 30 (1958–9), 65–71.
- van Hooft, Anton J.L., *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990.
- van Lennep, D.F. W., 'Atheense nozems', *Hermeneus*, 33 (1961–2), 186–97.
- van Looy, Herman, 'Youth violence in ancient Athens: 5th and 4th century BC', in *History of Juvenile Delinquency: A Collection of Essays on Crime Committed by Young Offenders, in History and in Selected Countries*, ed. Albert G. Hess and Priscilla F. Clement, Aalen: Scientia, 1990, pp. 71–125.
- van Lumey, Jan, *Narcissus: Het mysterie der zelfbespiegeling* (Wereld-Boog, 78), Amsterdam and Antwerp: Wereld-Bibliotheek, 1955.
- Vanoyeke, Violaine, *La Prostitution en Grèce et à Rome* (Réalia), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990.
- Väterlein, Jutta, *Roma ludens: Kinder und Erwachsene beim Spiel im antiken Rom* (Heuremata, 5), Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976.
- Verhaeghe, Jean, *Het mensbeeld in de aristotelische ethiek* (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren, 42, 94), Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1980.
- Veyne, Paul, 'Iconographie de la *transvectio equitum* et des lupercales', *Revue des études anciennes*, 62 (1960), 100–12.
- *Le Pain et le cirque: Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique* (Univers historique), Paris: Seuil, 1976.
- 'La famille et l'amour sous le Haut-Empire romain', *Annales (Economie, Sociétés, Civilisations)*, 33 (1978), 35–63.
- 'L'homosexualité à Rome', *L'Histoire*, 30 (1981), 76–8.
- *L'Élégie érotique romaine: L'amour, la poésie et l'Occident*, Paris: Seuil, 1983.

- *Histoire de la vie privée. I: De l'Empire romain à l'an mil*, sous la direction de Philippe Ariès et de Georges Duby (L'univers historique), Paris: Seuil, 1985.
- Ville, Georges, *La Gladiature en occident des origines à la mort de Domitien* (Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 245), Paris: de Boccard, 1982.
- Vischer, Eberhard, 'Eine anstößige Stelle in Augustins Konfessionen', in *Harnack-Ehrung: Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte*, Leipzig: J.E. Hinrichs, 1921, pp. 183–94.
- Volponi, M., 'M.Celio Rufo *ingeniose nequam*', in *Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo. Classe di Lettere*, 31, 3, Milano, 1970, pp. 197–280.
- von Albrecht, Michael, 'Der Dichter Lucan und die epische Tradition', in *Lucain*, entretiens préparés et présides par Marcel Dury. Vandoeuvres-Genève, Août 1968 (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 15), Vandoeuvres and Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1970, pp. 267–301, 302–8.
- von Arnim, Hans, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa. Mit einer Einleitung: Sophistik, Rhetorik, Philosophie in ihrem Kampf um die Jugendbildung*, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1898.
- Vretska, Karl, 'Gedanken über den jungen Vergil', in *Gestalt und Wirklichkeit: Festgabe für Ferdinand Weinhandl*, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1967, pp. 337–47.
- Wagenvoort, Hendrik, 'Buitenlandse studiereizen in de Oudheid', *Hermeneus*, 24 (1952–3), 2–8, 21–32.
- 'Ludus poeticus', in *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, Leiden: Brill, 1956, pp. 30–42.
- Walden, John W.H., *The Universities of Ancient Greece*, Freeport and New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970 (first publ. 1909).
- Wankenne, J., 'Faut-il réhabiliter l'empereur Néron?', *Les études classiques*, 49 (1981), 135–52.
- Wassermann, Felix M., 'The conflict of generations in Thucydides', in *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Stephen Bertman, Amsterdam: Grüner, 1976, pp. 119–21.
- Weinreich, Otto, *Die Distichen des Catull* (Libelli, 132), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975 (first publ. Tübingen, 1926).
- 'Catulls Attisgedicht', in *Catull*, hrsg. von R.Heine, Darmstadt, 1975, pp. 325–59 (first publ. in *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientale et Slavistique*, 4 (1936), 463–97).
- Weiss, E., 'Lex Plaetoria', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. 5 (1931), cols. 578–82.
- Wencis, Leonhard P., *The Social Significance of Youth in Greek New Comedy*, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International, 1973.
- Wesener, Gunter, 'Pubertas', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. 14 (1974), cols. 571–81.

- Whitaker, Richard, *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy: A Study in Poetic Technique* (Hypomnemata. Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben, 76), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1983.
- Wieacker, Franz, *Recht und Gesellschaft in der Spätantike* (Urban Bücher, 74), Stuttgart: W.Kohlhammer, 1964.
- Wiedemann, Thomas E.J., *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire*, London: Routledge, 1989.
- Wilkinson, Lancelot P., *Ovid Recalled*, Portway, Bath: Cebic Chivers, 1974 (first publ. Cambridge, 1955).
- *Classical Attitudes to Modern Issues: Population and Family Planning; Women's Liberation; Nudism in Deed and Word; Homosexuality*, London: William Kimber, 1979.
- Wille, Günther, *Musica romana: Die Bedeutung der Musik im Leben der Römer*, Amsterdam: Schippers, 1967.
- *Einführung in das römische Musikleben* (Altertumswissenschaft), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977.
- Wille, I., 'Catulls Gedicht 76 als Spiegelbild seines Liebeserlebnisses und seiner Liebesdichtung', *Das Altertum*, 10 (1964), 89–95.
- Williams, Gordon, *The Nature of Roman Poetry* (Opus, 49), London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Wimmel, Walter, *Der frühe Tibull* (Studia et testimonia antiqua), Munich: Fink, 1968.
- Winkler, John J., *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (The New Ancient World), New York and London: Routledge, 1990.
- Winkler, John J., 'The education of Chloe: hidden injuries of sex', in *The Constraints of Desire*, New York and London: Routledge, 1990, pp. 101–26.
- Wiseman, T.Peter, *Catullan Questions*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1969.
- *New Men in the Roman Senate: 139 BC-AD 14* (Oxford Classical and Philosophical Monographs), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- *Catullus and his World: A Reappraisal*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Wlosok, Antonie, 'Vater und Vaternovstellungen in der römischen Kultur', in *Das Vaterbild im Abendland*, hrsg. von Hubertus Tellenbach, vol. 1, Stuttgart: W.Kohlhammer, 1978, pp. 18–54.
- Wolf, Peter, *Vom Schulwesen der Spätantike: Studien zu Libanios*, Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1952.
- *Libanios und sein Kampf um die hellenische Bildung*, in *Museum Helveticum*, 11 (1954), 231–42.
- Woodman, A.J., 'Some implications of *otium* in Catullus 51.13–16', *Latomus*, 25 (1966), 217–26.

- Wyke, Maria, 'Written women: Propertius' *scripta puella*', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 77 (1987), 47–61.
- 'In pursuit of love: the poetic self and a process of reading: Augustan elegy in the 1980's', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 79 (1989), 165–73.
- Yardley, J.C., 'The elegiac *paraclausithyron*', *Eranos*, 76 (1978), 19–34.

INDEX LOCORUM

Achilles Tatius (2nd cent. AD),

Leucippe et Clitophon 4, 10, 1 (I n. 135, 145)

Ambrose (Ambrosius, c. AD 339–97)

Cain (De Cain et Abel) 1, 3, 11 (I n. 134, 137)

Ep. (Epistulae) 63, 98 (I n. 28)

Iob (De interpellatione Iob et David) 1, 7, 21 (I n. 50)

Is. (De Isaac vel anima) 7, 60 (I n. 143)

Noe (De Noe) 22, 81 (I n. 157)

Off. (De officiis ministrorum) 1, 44, 217 (I n. 188)

Valent. (De obitu Valentiniani consolatio) 17 (III n. 71)

Ammianus Marcellinus (c. AD 330–95), *Res gestae* 16, 1, 4 (V n. 96)

Anthologia Palatina 12, 4 (V n. 194);

12, 125 (V n. 195)

Appendix Vergiliana, Cat.

(*Catalepton*) 5 (IV n. 183)

Appian (2nd cent. AD)

Civ. (Bella civilia) 2, 17, 74 (II n. 40);

3, 4, 29 (II n. 143);

3, 11, 80 (II n. 144);

3, 11, 82 (II n. 141);

5, 3, 25 (II n. 123)

Iber. (Iberica) 6, 4, 18 (II n. 49)

Apuleius (c. AD 123–c. 185)

Apol. (Apologia) 5, 1 (IV n. 11);

23, 1–4 (IV n. 11);

55, 8–9 (IV n. 224);

66, 4–5 (II n. 177);

72, 5 (IV n. 52);

98, 5–6 (I n. 85);

98, 7 (III n. 85)

Flor. (Florida) 16, 9 (V n. 79);

20, 4 (IV n. 26)

Met. (Metamorphoses) 2, 18, 3–5 (III n. 161);

8, 1, 5ff. (V n. 181);

11, 23, 7 (IV n. 226)

Aristotle (384–322 BC)

Gen. An. (De generatione animalium) 1, 20, 728 a 11ff. (V n. 138)

Hist. An. (Historia animalium)

7, 1, 581 a 28ff. (V n. 138)

Nic. (Ethica Nicomachea) 8, 1,

2, 1155 a 13 (V n. 74);

8, 3, 4, 1156 a

24 (V n. 75);

8, 3, 5, 1156 a 32 (V n. 76);

8, 5, 2, 1157 b 14 (V n. 75);

8, 6, 1, 1158 a 2 (V n. 75);

8, 6, 4, 1158 a 18 (V n. 77);

8, 11, 5, 1161 a 25 (V n. 73);

8, 12, 4, 1161 b 34 (V n. 73)

Probl. (Problemata) 30, 1, 953 b 36ff. (V n. 138)

- Rhet. (Rhetorica)* 2, 12–14,
1389 a 3ff. (I n. 149);
2, 12, 1389 a 35 (V, 72)
- Artemidorus (2nd cent AD),
Onirocriticus 2, 20 (III n. 36)
- Augustan History (c. AD 300)
Ael. (Aelius) 175)
Aur. M. (M. Aurelius Antoninus)
2, 6 (IV n. 204);
4, 910 (III n. 19);
7, 2–3 (V n. 45);
19, 5 (III n. 93);
23, 8 (III n. 12)
Comm. (Commodus Antoninus)
12, 10–12 (III n. 93)
Hadr. (Hadrianus) 14, 5 (V n.
214)
Tac. (Tacitus) 6, 2–7 (II n. 156)
Tyr. (Tyranni triginta) 13, 2 (I
n. 167)
Ver. (Verus) 2, 10 (III n. 25)
- Augustine (Aurelius Augustinus, AD
354–430)
Ac. (Contra academicos) 1, 1, 1
(I n. 190);
2, 2, 3–4 (IV n. 13);
2, 2, 3 (V n. 62)
Civ. (De civitate Dei) 17, 20 (I
n. 174)
Conf. (Confessiones) 2, 2, 2 (I n.
134, 140; V n. 86);
2, 2, 3 (I n. 114);
2, 2, 4 (I n. 144);
2, 3, 6 (I n. 161);
2, 3, 7–8 (III n. 170);
2, 3, 7 (V n. 62);
2, 3, 8 (I n. 144);
2, 4, 9ff. (III n. 169);
3, 1, 1 (V n. 86);
3, 2, 2–4 (IV n. 251);
3, 3, 6 (III n. 208, 232);
3, 4, 7–8 (IV n. 187);
3, 4, 8 (IV n. 196);
3, 5, 9 (IV n. 153, 196);
4, 4, 7ff. (V n. 87);
4, 7, 11 (V n. 123);
4, 8, 13 (IV n. 23);
4, 16, 30–1 (IV n. 24);
5, 8, 14 (III n. 214, 226, 232; V
n. 62);
5, 8, 15 (V n. 62);
5, 12, 22 (III n. 232);
6, 7, 11–12 (III n. 55, 87);
6, 7, 12 (V n. 123);
6, 8, 13 (III n. 88);
6, 10, 17 (IV n. 201);
6, 11, 20 (V n. 165);
6, 12, 21 (V n. 166);
6, 12, 22ff. (V n. 179);
6, 12, 22 (V n. 165);
14, 14, 21–3 (V n. 97)
*Duab. an. (De duabus animabus
contra Manichaeos)* 9, 11 (I n.
175)
Ep. (Epistulae) 4, 1 (I n. 22);
98, 8 (IV n. 202);
117–18 (IV n. 18);
180, 2 (I n. 39)
Gen. litt. (De genesi ad litteram)
10, 13 (I n. 39)
Ord. (De ordine) 1, 2ff. (IV n.
261);
1, 8, 22 (III n. 48);
1, 8, 23–4 (V n. 124)
- Util. cr. (De utilitate credendi)* 1, 2
(IV n. 198, 199)
- Augustus (63 BC–AD 14), *Res gest.*
(*Index rerum gestarum*) 19, 2 (III
n. 176)
- Aurelius Victor (Sextus Aurelius
Victor, 4th cent. AD), *Caesares*
4, 1 (IV n. 91)
- Ausonius (Decimus Magnus
Ausonius, c. AD 310–95), *Ep.*
(*Epistularum liber*) 22, 73ff. (V
n. 11)

- Basil the Great (Basilius
Caesariensis, c. AD 330–79) *Ad
adolescentes, quomodo possint ex
gentilium libris fructum capere*
(IV n. 238) *Ep. (Epistulae)* 84 (II
n. 173) *Reg. fus. (Regulae fusius
tractatae)* 16, 1, 1 (I n. 135)
- BGU (Berliner Griechische
Urkunden) 423 (II n. 64);
846 (V n. 68)
- Caesar (*Corpus Caesarianum*, 584
5 BC), *Civ. (De bello civili)* 2, 38,
2 (II n. 37)
- Catullus (Gaius Valerius Catullus,
77?–47? BC) *Carmina* 1, 4 (IV n.
274);
1, 10 (IV n. 337);
5 (V n. 248);
5, 1–3 (IV n. 352);
5, 2 (IV n. 244; V n. 14);
6 (V n. 85);
7 (V n. 248);
8 (V p. 254);
9 (V p. 187);
10 (V n. 85);
11 (V n. 85);
12 (V n. 85);
13 (V n. 85);
15 (V n. 85, 212);
16 (V n. 212);
19 (V n. 81);
21 (V n. 212);
24 (V n. 212);
28, 15 (V n. 14);
29 (V n. 81);
29, 5 (V n. 14);
35 (V n. 85);
36, 18–20 (IV n. 250);
37 (V n. 256);
39 (V n. 81, 256);
40 (V n. 256);
43 (V n. 81);
48 (V n. 212);
49 (IV n. 314);
49, 1 (V n. 14);
50 (V p. 218);
50, 2 (IV n. 274);
50, 5 (IV n. 274);
51, 1–12 (V n. 235);
51, 13–16 (I n. 97);
53 (IV n. 145);
54 (V n. 81);
55 (V n. 85);
56 (V n. 85);
57 (V n. 81);
61 (IV p. 187);
61, 126–30 (V n. 210);
61, 126–7 (II n. 14);
61, 128ff. (III n. 4);
61, 146–8 (V n. 210);
62 (IV p. 187);
63 (IV p. 187; V n. 158);
64 (IV p. 187);
68 (V n. 85);
68, 15–18 (IV n. 257);
68, 17 (IV n. 274);
72, 3–4 (V n. 249);
73 (V n. 85);
76 (V n. 265);
77 (V n. 256);
81 (V n. 212);
82 (V n. 256);
91 (V n. 256);
95 (IV n. 329; V n. 85);
95 (V p. 217);
99 (V n. 212);
100 (V n. 85);
109, 6 (IV n. 357)
- Censorinus (3rd cent. AD), *De die
natali liber* 14, 2 (I n. 7)
- Cicero (Marcus Tullius Cicero, 106–
43 BC)
Ac. (Academica) 2, 3, 8 (I n. 133)
Att. (Epistulae ad Atticum) 1,
14, 5 (II n. 96, 97; III n. 118);
1, 16, 1 (II n. 95);

- 1, 16, 11 (II n. 96, 98, 118; III n. 118, 133);
 1, 18, 2 (II n. 95);
 1, 19, 8 (II n. 99);
 2, 7, 3 (II n. 100);
 2, 8, 1 (II n. 100, 119);
 2, 12, 2 (II n. 100);
 2, 18, 1 (II n. 112);
 2, 19, 3 (II n. 112);
 2, 24, 2ff. (II n. 113);
 6, 2, 2 (V n. 64);
 6, 3, 8 (V n. 64);
 6, 7, 1 (V n. 64);
 7, 3, 5 (II n. 115);
 7, 7, 6 (II n. 115);
 10, 4, 5–6 (V n. 58);
 12, 32, 2 (III n. 142);
 14, 7, 2 (III n. 142);
 16, 8, 1 (II n. 141), 16, 19, 1 (II n. 141)
Brut. (Brutus de claris oratoribus) 56, 207 (IV n. 81);
 81, 282 (II n. 44);
 89, 304ff. (IV n. 78);
 89, 306 (IV n. 182);
 90, 308 (IV n. 84);
 90, 309 (IV n. 83);
 90, 310 (IV n. 85);
 90, 311 (IV n. 26, 86);
 90, 312 (IV n. 88);
 91, 313 (IV n. 137);
 91, 314 (IV n. 90);
 91, 316 (IV n. 92, 137);
 95, 325–6 (IV n. 136);
 95, 326 (V n. 100)
ad Br. (Epistulae ad Brutum) 1,
 18, 4 (I n. 179)
Cael. (Pro Caelio) 1, 2 (II n. 192);
 3, 6 (V n. 207);
 3, 7–8 (II n. 192);
 4, 10 (II n. 92);
 5, 12 (II n. 92);
 6, 13 (II n. 89);
 8, 9 (V n. 12);
 12, 28 (I n. 65, 74, 127);
 12, 30 (I n. 94);
 15, 35 (III n. 13);
 15, 36 (III n. 153);
 16, 38 (III n. 154);
 31, 75 (I n. 52);
 17, 41 (I n. 53);
 18, 42 (I n. 62, 65, 71, 107, 129);
 18, 43 (I n. 74, 127);
 19, 44 (I n. 69);
 19, 47 (II n. 202);
 20, 48 (V n. 141);
 21, 53 (III n. 153);
 28, 67 (III n. 133);
 30, 73 (II n. 197);
 31, 76–7 (I n. 78);
 31, 76 (I n. 164);
 31, 77 (III n. 105)
Cat. (In Catilinam) 1, 6, 13 (II n. 91);
 2, 4, 8 (II n. 89, 91);
 2, 5, 10 (II n. 128, 133);
 2, 10, 22 (II n. 91);
 2, 10, 23 (II n. 91)
C.M. (Cato Maior de senectute)
 6, 20 (I n. 170);
 10, 33 (I n. 24, 155, 181);
 11, 38 (I n. 28);
 20, 76 (I n. 24)
Deiot. (Pro rege Deiotaro) 1, 1
 (II n. 196)
Fam. (Epistulae ad familiares)
 2, 6, 3 (II n. 105);
 5, 8, 2 (V n. 111);
 5, 8, 4 (V n. 111);
 8, 13, 1 (I n. 112);
 8, 13, 2 (V n. 13);
 8, 14, 3 (II n. 116);
 9, 22, 2 (V n. 152);
 9, 26, 2 (V n. 162);
 13, 29, 1 (V n. 111);
 16, 21 (V n. 57)

Fin. (De finibus bonorum et malorum) 5, 2, 5 (IV n. 54);
5, 18, 48 (IV n. 9)
Font. (Pro M.Fonteio) 19, 42 (II n. 53)
Har. (De haruspicum responsis)
3, 4 (II n. 94);
20, 42 (II n. 43)
Inv. (De inventione) 1, 1 (IV n. 96)
Lae. (Laelius de amicitia) 1, 1 (IV n. 41; V n. 110);
20, 74 (V n. 78)
Mil. (Pro T.Annio Milone) 4, 9 (V n. 202)
Mur. (Pro L.Murena) 24, 49 (II n. 91);
35, 74 (II n. 105)
Off. (De officiis) 1, 5, 129 (V n. 146);
1, 15, 47 (V n. 78);
1, 32, 117–18 (I n. 42, 44, 45);
1, 34, 122 (I n. 168; V n. 1);
1, 34, 123 (I n. 103);
1, 45, 160 (V n. 28);
2, 13, 45 (II n. 18, 31, 123, 201);
2, 13, 46 (V n. 94)
Or. (Orator ad Marcum Brutum) 9, 30 (IV n. 141)
De or. (De oratore) 1, 2, 5 (IV n. 94);
1, 10, 40 (II n. 181);
1, 21, 97 (V n. 112);
1, 26, 121 (II n. 181, 195);
1, 34, 154 (IV n. 79);
1, 52, 233 (I n. 25);
2, 1, 1ff. (IV n. 76);
2, 1, 3 (V n. 110);
2, 21, 88–9 (IV n. 135);
2, 21, 89 (V n. 112);
3, 13, 51 (IV n. 160);
3, 20, 121 (II n. 181);
3, 24, 93–4 (IV n. 60)

Phil. (In M.Antonium orationes Philippicae) 2, 7, 16 (II n. 107);
2, 11, 26 (II n. 124);
2, 18, 44–6 (II n. 101; V n. 208);
5, 17, 47 (I n. 122, 131; II n. 141);
5, 17, 48 (II n. 136);
14, 10, 28 (II n. 141)
Q. fr. (Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem) 1, 2, 15 (II n. 120);
2, 3, 4 (II n. 122)
Rab. Post. (Pro C.Rabirio Postumo) 10, 26 (III n. 105)
Red. sen. (Oratio post reditum prima, cum senatui gratias egit)
5, 12 (II n. 109)
Rep. (De republica) 1, 43, 67 (I n. 105; V n. 37);
4, 4, 4 (V n. 146)
Rosc. Am. (Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino) 1, 1–3 (II n. 199);
11, 30, 2 (II n. 199)
Sest. (Pro P.Sestio) 12, 27 (II n. 109);
23, 51 (IV n. 346);
65, 136–9 (IV n. 376)
Sull. (Pro P. Sulla) 16, 46–7 (II n. 191)
Top. (Topica) 7, 32 (I n. 187)
Tusc. (Tusculanae disputationes) 1, 34, 83 (IV n. 214);
2, 1, 1 (IV n. 170);
2, 16, 38 (II n. 39);
3, 19, 45 (IV n. 243);
4, 33, 70 (V n. 186, 190);
5, 20, 58 (V n. 186, 190);
5, 21, 62 (I n. 175)
Verr. (In Verrem actio secunda)
(2)3, 1, 3 (II n. 197, 203)
Cicero (Quintus Tullius Cicero, 102–43 BC), *Commentariolum petitionis* 1, 3 (II n. 105; V n. 99);
1, 6 (II n. 105);
8, 33 (II n. 105)

- CIG (Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum)* 14, 1102 (III n. 39); 14, 1104 (III n. 39)
- CIL (Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum)* IV, 2400E (IV n. 326); IV, 3711 (IV n. 326); IV, 5086 (IV n. 326)
- Claudian (Claudius Claudianus, c. AD 375-c. 404), *Carm. min. (Carmina minora)* 22, 6 (IV n. 311)
- Clement of Alexandria (Titus Flavius Clemens, c. AD 150-c. 214), *Quis dives (Quis dives salvetur?)* 8, 3 (I n. 135)
- Codex Iustinianus* (6th cent. AD) 2, 22, 1 (I n. 56); 2, 35, 2 (I n. 56); 5, 59, 4 (I n. 135); 6, 61, 8, 5 (I n. 135); 10, 49(50)1 (III n. 237); 20, 39(40)2 (III n. 237)
- Commodian (3rd cent. AD), *Apol. (Carmen apologeticum)* 3–6 (I n. 162)
- Curtius (Quintus Curtius Rufus, 1st cent. AD), *Historiae Alexandri Magni* 10, 5, 26 (I n. 94)
- Digest* (6th cent. AD), *Praef. const. omn. (Constitutio 'Omnem' de conceptione digestorum, Praefatio)* 9 (III n. 216); 4, 4, 1 Pr. (II n. 175); 4, 4, 7, 5 (I n. 133); 4, 4, 11, 5 (I n. 56); 4, 4, 24, 2 (I n. 175); 9 (III n. 216); 27, 10, 4 (I n. 133); 47, 9, 5 (V n. 35); 48, 19, 28, 3 (III n. 75); 50, 2, 6, 1 (II n. 161); 50, 2, 11 (II n. 161); 50, 4, 8 (II n. 161); 50, 5, 2 Pr. (II n. 161)
- Dio (Dio Cassius, c. AD 155-c. 235), *Historia romana* 21, 70, 3 (I n. 131); 45, 34, 3 (I n. 105); 46, 8, 4 (II n. 111); 46, 41, 4 (II n. 145); 46, 46, 2 (II n. 146); 52, 20, 1 (I n. 18, II n. 174); 52, 26, 1–2 (III n. 182); 55, 13, 6 (III n. 178); 59, 5, 2–4 (III n. 92); 59, 14, 5 (III n. 53); 61, 8, 1 (III n. 165); 61, 9, 2–4 (III n. 165); 61, 20, 3–4 (III n. 65); 69, 11, 2–4 (V n. 214); 72, 17, 2 (III n. 93); 72, 19, 1–6 (III n. 93); 76, 7, 1ff. (III n. 54)
- Diodorus Siculus (fl. c. 60–30 BC), *Bibliotheca historica* 73, 3, 2–5 (III n. 97)
- Diogenes Laertius (3rd cent. AD), *De clarorum philosophorum vitis* 2, 86 (IV n. 214); 6, 7, 96–7 (IV n. 181)
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus (fl. 30–8 BC) *Antiquitates romanae* 2, 26, 1ff. (V n. 35); 5, 64ff. (II n. 70); 6, 39, 1 (II n. 72); 6, 65, 2–3 (II n. 23, 73); 6, 66, 1–2 (II n. 74); 8, 62 (V n. 63); 10, 2, 1 (II n. 75); 10, 5, 1ff. (II n. 76); 10, 7 (III n. 159); 10, 7, 3 (V n. 21); 10, 39, 3 (II n. 97); 10, 41, 3–4 (II n. 78, 97); 11, 2, 1ff. (II n. 75)

- De comp. verb. (De compositione verborum)* 1, 4–5 (IV n. 151)
- Epictetus (c. AD 55–c. 135)
Diss. (Dissertationes) 1, 9, 12–18 (IV n. 213);
 1, 26, 5–7 (IV n. 172);
 2, 10, 7 (V n. 29);
 2, 16, 30 (IV n. 179);
 2, 19, 12ff. (IV n. 195);
 3, 1, 1 (III n. 106);
 3, 1, 13 (III n. 106);
 3, 1, 35 (III n. 114);
 3, 15, 5–6 (III n. 34);
 3, 24, 78 (IV n. 178);
 4, 8, 34 (IV n. 209);
 4, 11, 25ff. (IV n. 209)
Ench. (Enchiridion) 29, 3 (III n. 34);
 33, 8 (IV n. 209);
 47 (IV n. 209)
- Eunapius (c. AD 345–c. 420), *Vitae sophistarum* 457ff. (IV n. 222);
 473ff. (IV n. 223);
 483–5 (III n. 224);
 485 (III n. 205);
 486 (III n. 213);
 487 (IV n. 14)
- Euripides (c. 485–406 BC), *Hipp. (Hippolytus)* 84ff., 616ff., 848ff., 1002ff., 1389ff. (V n. 168)
- Eusebius of Caesarea (c. AD 260–340)
H.E. (Historia ecclesiastica) 6, 8, 1ff. (V n. 160)
Mart. Pal. (De martyribus Palestinae) 4, 2 (III n. 218)
- Flavius Iosephus (c. AD 37/8–c. 95), *Ant. (Antiquitates Iudaecae)* 19, 130 (III n. 84)
- Florus (Annius Florus, 2nd cent. AD), *Bellorum romanorum libri duo* 1, 17, 9 (I n. 52)
- Fronto (Marcus Cornelius Fronto, c. AD 100–c. 166) *Ad M. Caes. (Epistulae ad M. Aurelium)* 1, 3, 4ff. (V n. 121);
 2, 5 (V n. 120);
 2, 10, 2 (IV n. 237);
 4, 4 (IV n. 55)
De eloquentia 3, 4 (IV n. 116, 117, 174);
 3, 5 (IV n. 115);
 4, 3 (IV n. 117, 174)
Ep. Graec. (Epistulae Graecae) 7, 1 (V n. 120)
Nep. am. (De nepote amisso) 5 (I n. 31)
- Gaius (2nd cent. AD),
Institutiones 1, 55 (V n. 32)
- Galen (Claudius Galenus, AD 129–99?), *Protr. (Protrepticus)* 2 (III n. 33);
 9 (III n. 33);
 11 (III n. 33);
 14 (III n. 33);
 II, 179 (IV, 16);
 X, 457 (IV n. 33) (ed. Kühn)
- Gellius (Aulus Gellius, c. AD 130 c. 180), *Noctes Atticae* 1, 2 (IV n. 195);
 1, 9, 8–10 (IV n. 179);
 1, 10 (IV n. 161);
 2, 15, 1–2 (V n. 2);
 6, 12, 4–5 (III n. 110);
 7, 10, 5 (IV n. 179);
 7, 13 (IV n. 20);
 9, 15 (IV n. 129);
 10, 3, 5 (V n. 23);
 10, 28 (II n. 6);
 15, 13, 3 (I n. 98);
 15, 28 (II n. 183);
 18, 2 (IV n. 21);

- 18, 2, 7 (IV n. 38);
18, 2, 12 (IV n. 38);
18, 2, 14 (IV n. 38);
20, 4, 1–3 (III n. 73)
- Gregory of Nazianzen (AD 329/30–90)
C. (Carminum libri duo) 2, 1, 45, 30ff. (III n. 102)
Or. (Orationes) 43, 15–24 (V n. 91);
43, 15 (III n. 204);
43, 16 (III n. 209, 210, 213);
43, 24 (III n. 239)
- Gregory Thaumaturgus (c. AD 213–c. 275), *In Origenem oratio panegyrica* (III n. 238)
- Heliodor (fl. AD 220–50),
Aethiopica 3, 5 (V n. 225)
- Herodian (c. AD 170–c. 250), *Ab excessu divi Marci libri octo* 1, 1, 6 (II n. 155);
1, 3–4 (I n. 87);
1, 15, 1–6 (III n. 93);
3, 10, 1ff. (III n. 54);
6, 1, 5ff. (V n. 66)
- Himerius (c. AD 310–c. 390), *Or. (Orationes)* 15 (III n. 230);
22 (III n. 225);
22, 7 (III n. 220)
- Homer (8th cent. BC), *Od. (Odyssea)* 15, 245–7 (I n. 31)
- Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus, 65–8 BC)
A.P. (De arte poetica) 114–16 (IV n. 132);
156–78 (I n. 152);
161 (V n. 71);
161–2 (III n. 5);
163 (I n. 47, 156, 171, 178);
164 (I n. 176; III n. 138);
165 (I n. 158, 189);
167 (I n. 163);
173–4 (I n. 185);
- 295ff. (IV n. 254)
C. (Carmina) 1, 8 (III n. 7);
1, 16, 22–6 (IV n. 311);
3, 2 (II n. 54);
3, 24, 54ff. (III n. 18);
4, 10, 2 (V n. 196)
Ep. (Epistulae) 1, 1, 23–5 (IV n. 337);
1, 2, 31–2 (V n. 140);
2, 1, 76ff. (IV n. 242);
2, 1, 108–10 (IV n. 253);
2, 1, 145–6 (II n. 14);
2, 2, 55–7 (IV n. 321);
2, 2, 141–4 (IV n. 321)
Epod. (Epodon liber) 11, 4 (V n. 211);
16, 1ff. (IV n. 369)
S. (Sermones) 1, 2 (V n. 151);
1, 2, 15–17 (I n. 85; III n. 145);
1, 2, 28ff. (V n. 231);
1, 6, 65ff. (IV n. 13);
1, 6, 89–97 (V n. 46);
1, 10, 31–5 (IV n. 337);
1, 10, 36–48 (IV n. 337);
2, 3, 247–9 (III n. 3);
2, 3, 325 (V n. 211);
2, 5 (III n. 149)
- Iamblichus (fl. c. AD 160–80),
V.Pyth. (De vita Pythagorica) 5, 21ff. (IV n. 217);
8, 37 (IV n. 217);
17, 71 (IV n. 217);
18, 80ff. (IV n. 216);
21, 95ff. (IV n. 216);
31, 202–3 (I n. 49);
31, 210 (V n. 156);
32, 201 (IV n. 217)
- Isidorus of Seville (c. AD 560–636),
Orig. (Originum sive etymologiarum libri viginti) 11, 2, 2ff. (I n. 7);
11, 2, 27 (I n. 36)

Jerome (Sophronius Eusebius

Hieronymus, c. AD 348–420)

*Eccl. (Commentarius in**Ecclesiasten*) 4, 13/16 (I n. 38)*Ep. (Epistulae)* 22, 30 (IV n.

153, 240);

52 (V n. 122);

52, 1 (IV n. 146);

52, 3 (I n. 142);

52, 11 (I n. 142);

60, 11 (V n. 122);

79, 7 (I n. 55);

121, 8 (I n. 182);

123, 4 (I n. 101);

125, 1 (I n. 134, 141)

Jov. (Adversus Iovinianum) 1,

49 (V n. 176)

John Cassian (c. AD 360–430),

Conl. (Conlationes) 14, 12–13 (IV
n. 238)

John Chrysostom (c. AD 354–407)

De Anna (Sermones de Anna) 3, 4
(II n. 167)*Ep. (Epistulae)* 3, 12 (I n. 138)*Ep. I ad Tim. (In epistulam
primam ad Timotheum**commentarius)* 9, 2 (I n. 52)*In gloria (De inani gloria, sive
de liberis educandis)* 76 (I n.

117);

81–2 (I n. 117)

*Matt. (Commentarius in**Matthaeum)* 49, 5–6 (III n. 108,
148);

81, 5 (I n. 51, 52, 61)

Sacerd. (De sacerdotio) 1, 1ff.
(V n. 90)Julian (Flavius Claudius Julianus,
AD 332–63)*Euseb. (Eusebia)* 15, 123D–124D
(IV n. 249)*Heracl. (Pros Heraclion)* 235AB
(IV n. 223)Juvenal (Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis,
c. AD 50–140), *Saturae* 1, 58–62
(III n. 126);

3, 278ff. (III n. 163; V n. 20);

5, 117 (III n. 180);

7, 213–14 (V n. 10);

7, 238ff. (V n. 138);

10, 224 (V n. 191);

10, 295–8 (V n. 192);

10, 300–3 (I n. 193);

11, 201–2 (III n. 52, 147);

13, 53–9 (V n. 18);

14, 38ff. (V n. 144).

Lactantius (Caelius Firmianus

Lactantius, c. AD 250–c. 320),

*Div. inst. (Divinarum
institutionum libri septem)* 6, 3,
6ff. (I n. 43)

Libanius (AD 314–c. 393)

Chriae 3 (IV n. 124)*Ep. (Epistulae)* 550, 1 (IV n.
13);

552, 12 (IV n. 13);

715, 3 (III n. 222);

843 (III n. 32);

1017 (III n. 32);

1124, 6 (IV n. 49);

1330 (III n. 230);

1330, 3 (III n. 32);

1458, 1 (III n. 212)

Or. (Orationes) 1, 4–5 (IV n.
12);

1, 5 (III n. 56, 86);

1, 16 (III n. 206);

1, 19–21 (III n. 222);

1, 19 (III n. 206, 219);

1, 21 (III n. 229);

1, 22 (III n. 219);

1, 25 (III n. 227);

1, 27 (IV n. 122);

1, 85 (III n. 227);

3, 6 (III n. 219);

3, 11–14 (III n. 234);

- 3, 11 (III n. 47);
 3, 12 (III n. 56, 223);
 3, 17 (IV n. 114);
 3, 22–3 (III n. 223);
 4, 18 (IV n. 44);
 18, 18 (IV n. 223);
 19, 29 (III n. 235);
 22, 6 (III n. 235);
 23, 11 (III n. 235);
 23, 20 (III n. 235);
 23, 26–7 (III n. 235);
 34, 6–14 (III n. 235);
 35, 5 (II n. 167);
 35, 13 (III n. 56);
 41, 6–9 (III n. 74);
 43, 4 (IV n. 46);
 43, 6ff. (III n. 233);
 58, 4–5 (III n. 229);
 58, 18 (III n. 229);
 62, 21–3 (IV n. 44);
 62, 24–5 (III n. 135);
 62, 24 (I n. 105)
- Livy (Titus Livius, 59? BC–AD 17?),
Ab urbe condita 1, 9, 6ff. (II n. 12);
 1, 18, 2 (IV n. 218);
 2, 3–5 (II n. 70);
 2, 3, 2–3 (II n. 69);
 2, 12, 2ff. (II n. 26);
 2, 28, 9 (II n. 71);
 2, 56, 11 (II n. 97);
 3, 11, 3ff. (II n. 76);
 3, 12, 7 (I n. 169);
 3, 13 (III n. 159);
 3, 14, 2ff. (II n. 78);
 4, 14, 6 (II n. 79);
 5, 22, 5 (I n. 62);
 5, 39, 12 (II n. 7);
 6, 23, 3–6 (II n. 47);
 6, 42, 13 (II n. 79);
 7, 1 (II n. 15);
 7, 2, 1ff. (III n. 77);
 7, 4–5 (V n. 43);
 7, 6 (II n. 25);
- 8, 7, 1ff. (II n. 34);
 8, 12, 1 (II n. 34; V n. 33);
 8, 28 (V n. 200);
 8, 30, 4ff. (II n. 45);
 21, 46, 7 (II n. 270);
 22, 53 (II n. 38);
 23, 40, 4 (II n. 36);
 26, 18, 11 (II n. 49);
 26, 19, 9 (I n. 133, II n. 49);
 26, 22, 15 (V n. 38);
 28, 40, 7 (II n. 46);
 28, 40, 9ff. (II n. 51);
 28, 43, 1ff. (II n. 51);
 38, 52, 11 (II n. 180);
 40, 7, 2 (I n. 188; III n. 136)
- Longus (c. AD 200), *Daphnis et Chloe* 1, 13, 1ff (V n. 224);
 1, 17–19 (V n. 224)
- Lucan (Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, AD 39–65), *Pharsalia* 7, 270–2 (III n. 23);
 9, 980–6 (IV n. 337)
- Lucian (c. AD 120–c. 180)
Alex. (Alexander) 44 (IV n. 53)
Dea Syr. (Dea Syria) 51 (V n. 159)
Hermot. (Hermotimus) 81 (IV n. 212)
Nigr. (Nigrinus) 27–8 (IV n. 208)
Somn. (Somnium sive vita Luciani) 1ff. (IV n. 67);
 18 (IV n. 68)
V.H. (Verae historiae) 2, 28 (V n. 195)
- Lucretius (Titus Lucretius Carus, 94–55 BC), *De rerum natura* 4, 1139ff. (V n. 257)
- Macrobius (Ambrosius Macrobius Theodosius, fl. c. AD 400), *Sat. (Saturnalia)* 1, 12, 16 (II n. 5);
 3, 14, 4–7 (III n. 43);
 3, 17, 3–5 (III n. 110);
 3, 17, 4 (III n. 148; V n. 203);

- 7, 11, 1–3 (I n. 196)
 Manilius (Marcus Manilius, fl. c. AD 14), *Astronomica* 5, 143ff. (III n. 110)
 Marcus Aurelius (AD 121–80), *In se ipsum* 9, 21, 2 (I n. 22)
 Martial (Marcus Valerius Martialis, c. AD 40–c. 104), *Epigrammata* 7, 32 (III n. 31); 10, 68 (III n. 24)
 Maximianus (fl. c. AD 550), *Elegiae* 1, 105ff. (I n. 187)
 Musonius Rufus (1st cent. AD), fr. 12 (V n. 157)
- Nicolaus of Damascus (b. c. 64 BC), *V. Caes.* (*Vita Caesaris*) 4 (I n. 61; II n. 148); 5 (V n. 163); 13 (I n. 194); 15 (I n. 94, V n. 163)
 Nonius (Nonius Marcellus, 4th cent. AD), *De compendiosa doctrina* p. 239 (V n. 96)
- Ocellus Lucanus (c. 150 BC) 54 (V n. 156)
 Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso, 43 BC–AD 17?)
Am. (*Amores*) 1, 10, 3 (V n. 251); 1, 15, 7–8 (IV n. 337); 1, 20, 29–36 (IV n. 297); 2, 1, 3 (IV n. 352); 2, 1, 5ff. (IV n. 245); 2, 4, 45–6 (V n. 230); 2, 19, 3 (V n. 232)
Ars (*Ars amatoria*) 1, 91–2 (III n. 52); 1, 127 (V n. 234); 1, 135ff. (III n. 52); 2, 663ff. (V n. 230); 2, 682 (IV n. 297); 2, 727–8 (IV n. 297); 3, 311ff. (V n. 229); 3, 567ff. (V n. 253); 3, 571–3 (V n. 233)
F. (*Fasti*) 3, 777–8 (I n. 82); 6, 83–4 (II n. 5); 6, 85–6 (II n. 41); 6, 88 (II n. 10)
Her. (*Heroides*) 15, 85–6 (V n. 197)
Met. (*Metamorphoses*) 3, 339ff. (V n. 167)
Trist. (*Tristia*) 4, 10, 1ff. (IV n. 259); 4, 10, 41–2 (IV n. 236)
- Panegyrici latini* 5, 5, 4 (I n. 52); 12, 7, 2–4 (I n. 123, 128); 12, 7, 4 (I n. 136)
P. Oxy. (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*) I 119 (V n. 59)
 Paulinus of Pella (AD 376–c. 460), *Eucharisticus* 141ff. (III n. 20, 123)
 Persius (Aulus Persius Flaccus, AD 34–62), *Saturae* 1, 10 (III n. 4); 1, 333 (V n. 148); 1, 134 (III n. 180); 5, 21ff. (IV n. 184); 5, 30 ff. (I n. 83, 84)
 Petronius (Petronius Arbiter, fl. AD 60), *Satiricon* 4, 1–2 (II n. 185); 4, 4 (II n. 185; IV n. 118); 46, 5–7 (IV n. 8); 46, 7–8 (IV n. 42); 59, 1 (I n. 144)
 Phaedrus (c. 15 BC–c. AD 50), *Fabulae Aesopiae* 115, 1ff. (V n. 22); 115, 4 (I n. 135)
 Philostratus (Flavius Philostratus, c. AD 170–c. 250) *V. Apol.* (*Vita Apollonii*) 1, 7 (IV n. 219); 1, 8 (IV n. 205); 1, 13 (IV n. 205);

- 1, 18 (IV n. 51);
4, 17 (IV n. 219);
8, 21 (IV n. 219);
8, 31 (IV n. 220)
V.S. (Vitae sophistarum) 1, 21,
518 (V n. 103);
1, 21, 520 (IV n. 65; V n. 104);
1, 22, 523 (IV n. 113);
2, 7, 577 (IV n. 127);
2, 10, 587 (V n. 101, 105)
- Photius (9th cent AD), *Bibl.*
(*Bibliotheca*) Cod. 80 p. 60 (III
n. 211)
- Plato (c. 429–347 BC)
Gorg. (*Gorgias*) 484C (IV n.
169)
Phil. (*Philebus*) 6, 15D–16A (I
n. 41)
Rep. (*Respublica*) 8, 562E–563B
(I n. 104; V n. 37)
- Plautus (Titus Maccius Plautus, c.
250–184 BC)
Amph. (*Amphitruo*) 153ff. (III
n. 160)
Bacch. (*Bacchides*) 193 (V n.
247);
505–8 (V n. 53)
Curc. (*Curculio*) 36–7 (V n. 133)
Merc. (*Mercator*) 40–2 (I n. 81);
46ff (V n. 180, 263);
984 (I n. 26)
Most. (*Mostellaria*) 85ff. (I n.
81);
149–51 (I n. 81);
233–4 (V n. 53);
959–61 (III n. 132)
Poen. (*Poenulus*) 257–8 (V n.
227)
Pseud. (*Pseudolus*) 117–20 (V
n. 53);
303–4 (I n. 15);
434–5 (I n. 67)
Stich. (*Stichus*) 606 (III n. 160)
- Trin.* (*Trinumni*) 223ff. (I n. 45;
V n. 154);
264ff. (V n. 154);
313–16 (III n. 160)
- Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius
Secundus, AD 23/4–79),
Naturalis historia 13, 43, 136 (III
n. 165);
20, 57, 160 (V n. 102);
35, 47, 168 (III n. 23)
- Pliny the Younger (Gaius Plinius
Caecilius Secundus, c. AD 61–c.
112)
Ep. (*Epistulae*) 1, 18, 3–4 (II n.
198);
2, 14, 2–4 (II n. 187);
2, 14, 12–13 (IV n. 165);
3, 1, 2 (I n. 160);
3, 1, 8 (III n. 24);
3, 3, 3–4 (V n. 145);
3, 3, 4 (I n. 60);
4, 16, 2 (IV n. 74);
6, 6, 5–6 (V n. 117);
6, 11, 1–3 (II n. 189; V n. 117);
6, 20, 5 (IV n. 36);
7, 20, 4 (IV n. 73; V n. 113);
7, 22, 2 (IV n. 8);
7, 24, 4–5 (III n. 70);
8, 14, 4ff. (I n. 91; II n. 59);
8, 23, 1–4 (V n. 116);
8, 23, 2–3 (V n. 5);
9, 12 (III n. 122);
10, 96, 9 (I n. 25)
Pan. (*Panegyricus Traiano*
dictus) 33, 1 (III n. 82);
81, 2 (I n. 91; III n. 15)
- Plutarch (c. AD 50–c. 120)
I. *Moralia*
Am. prolis (*De amore prolis*) 4,
497A (V n. 47)
Aud. (*De recta ratione*
audiendi) *passim* (IV n. 233);
1, 37CE (I n. 86);
4ff. (IV n. 179);

- 7, 41BD (IV n. 190);
 9, 42E (IV n. 190);
 10, 43A (IV n. 31);
 11, 43BC (IV n. 31)
*Coniug. praec. (Coniugalium
 praecepta)* 47, 144F (I n. 103)
*Cons. Ap. (Consolatio ad
 Apollonium)* 34, 119E (I n. 31)
*E ap. Delph. (De E apud
 Delphos)* 7, 387F (IV n. 30)
Frat. am. (De fraterno amore)
 19, 490B (V n. 80)
*De lib. et aegr. (De libidine et
 aegritudine)* 9 (I n. 146)
*Praec. ger. resp. (Praecepta
 gerendae rei publicae)* 12, 806E
 (II n. 84)
*Prof. virt. (Quomodo quis suos
 in virtute sentiat profectus?)* 7,
 78EF (IV n. 194);
 7, 78E (IV n. 28)
*Quaest. Rom. (Quaestiones
 romanae)* 40, 274D (III n. 23)
*An seni (An seni respublica
 gerenda sit) passim* (II n. 152);
 2, 784C (I n. 124);
 2, 784D (I n. 126);
 7, 787C (I n. 126);
 12, 790D (I n. 126);
 13, 791BC (I n. 126, 165);
 18, 793E (I n. 130);
 19, 794A (p. 1, 1 n. 75);
 25, 796A (I n. 126, 163)
Virt. mor. (De virtute morali) 8,
 448E (V n. 118);
 11, 450EF (I n. 146)
 II. *Vitae parallelae*
Aem. (Aemilius Paullus) 21, 1–2
 (II n. 29);
 22, 1–4 (II n. 28);
 27, 4 (II n. 35);
 28, 6 (IV n. 234)
Ant. (Antonius) 2, 3 (II n. 101);
 2, 4 (II n. 102);
 12, 1 (II n. 13)
Brut. (Brutus) 24, 2 (II n. 30,
 31, 125)
Caes. (Caesar) 8, 2 (II n. 108);
 19, 2 (III n. 153);
 61, 2 (II n. 13)
Cato Mai. (Cato Maior) 4, 1 (V
 n. 98);
 15, 3 (II n. 170);
 20, 4–7 (IV n. 3);
 22, 2–5 (IV n. 175; V n. 106)
Cato Min. (Cato Minor) 7, 2 (IV
 n. 311);
 14, 3 (II n. 117)
Cic. (Cicero) 3, 2–4 (II n. 183);
 3, 4 (II n. 200; IV n. 91);
 10, 3 (II n. 91);
 13, 4 (II n. 109);
 14, 5 (II n. 106);
 24, 6 (V n. 56);
 32, 1 (II n. 109);
 33, 5 (II n. 109);
 40, 1 (II n. 110)
Cor. (Coriolanus) 33–6 (V n. 63)
Crass. (Crassus) 6, 2 (II n. 84);
 13, 4 (II n. 109)
Fab. Max. (Fabius Maximus)
 25–6 (II n. 50, 51)
Luc. (Lucullus) 1, 2 (II n. 207);
 34 (II n. 43)
*Lyc. et Numa (Lycurgus et
 Numa)* 4, 1–2 (V n. 183)
Marc. (Marcellus) 2, 3–4 (V n.
 201)
Mar. (Marius) 4, 2 (II n. 194)
Pomp. (Pompeius) 6 (II n. 139);
 8, 2 (II n. 139);
 13, 4 (II n. 139);
 14 (II n. 139);
 24, 2 (II n. 121)
Publ. (Publicola) 3–6 (II n. 70)
Rom. (Romulus) 21, 3–5 (II n.
 13)
Sull. (Sulla) 8, 2 (II n. 84)

- Them. (Themistocles)* 2, 5 (I n. 75)
- Ps.-Plutarch
Lib. ed. (De liberis educandis)
 5, 3E (I n. 179);
 14, 10C (V n. 17);
 16, 12AC (I n. 49, 59, 61);
 16, 12B (III n. 143, 147);
 17, 2Fff. (V n. 49);
 17, 13AC (I n. 100);
 18, 13F (I n. 182);
 19, 13F (I n. 116)
Plac. phil. (De placitis philosophorum) 5, 23, 909CD (I n. 36)
- Polybius (c. 203-c. 118 BC),
Historiae 6, 54, 3 (II n. 19);
 21, 23-5 (V n. 125);
 31, 23, 4 (IV n. 234);
 31, 25, 2ff. (I n. 91; III n. 17, 97);
 31, 25, 4-5 (V n. 209);
 31, 25, 4 (III n. 42, 131; V n. 218);
 31, 29, 3ff. (III n. 17);
 31, 29, 8-10 (II n. 178)
- Procopius (6th cent. AD)
Anecd. (Anecdota) 7, 1 (III n. 57);
 7, 15-21 (III n. 162)
Pers. (De bello Persico) 1, 24, 2 (III n. 57)
- Propertius (Sextus Propertius, c. 47-15 BC), *Elegiae* 1, 6, 27-8 (V n. 261);
 1, 6, 29-30 (IV n. 350);
 1, 11, 23-6 (V n. 246);
 1, 12, 20 (V n. 260);
 2, 3, 9ff. (V n. 229);
 2, 6, 41-2 (V n. 246);
 2, 17, 13-18 (IV n. 366);
 2, 7, 19ff. (V n. 246);
 2, 7A, 19-20 (IV n. 356);
 2, 10, 1-8 (IV n. 323);
 2, 10, 7-8 (IV n. 309);
 2, 13, 35-6 (V n. 256);
 2, 15, 41-6 (IV n. 366);
 2, 18, 33-4 (V n. 250);
 2, 23, 23-4 (V n. 237);
 2, 29, 1ff. (V n. 255);
 2, 30, 1 (IV n. 244; V n. 14);
 2, 30, 13-14 (IV n. 352);
 3, 2, 25-6 (IV n. 337);
 3, 5, 1 (IV n. 365);
 4, 1, 131-4 (IV n. 258, 350);
 4, 1, 132 (I n. 82);
 4, 7 (IV n. 324);
 4, 8 (IV n. 324)
- Prudentius (Aurelius Clemens Prudentius, AD 348-c. 405),
Symm. (Contra Symmachum) 2, 320 (I n. 144)
- Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaeus, fl. AD 127-48), *Tetr. (Tetrabiblos)*
 4, 10, 203-7 (I n. 150);
 4, 10, 205 (I n. 163)
- Quintilian (Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, c. AD 35-c. 100),
Institutio oratoria 1 Pr. 7 (IV n. 112);
 1, 2, 2 (V n. 191);
 1, 2, 4-8 (V n. 145);
 1, 2, 20 (V n. 78);
 1, 3, 14-17 (V n. 9);
 1, 3, 17 (V n. 191);
 1, 8, 4-8 (V n. 147);
 1, 8, 6-7 (IV n. 232);
 1, 10, 9ff. (III n. 44);
 1, 10, 31 (III n. 44);
 1, 11, 15 (III n. 30);
 1, 11, 19 (III n. 44);
 2, 2, 3 (V n. 191);
 2, 2, 9-12 (IV n. 107, 123);
 2, 2, 14-15 (V n. 191);
 2, 4, 3-8 (IV n. 134);
 2, 4, 9 (I n. 30);
 2, 4, 15-16 (IV n. 120);

- 2, 5, 22 (IV n. 148);
 2, 6, 3 (III n. 231);
 2, 8, 9 (III n. 231);
 2, 10, 4–6 (IV n. 110);
 3, 8, 70 (IV n. 121);
 4, 2, 69 (V n. 199);
 5, 12, 18 (IV n. 154);
 6, 2, 6 (V n. 226);
 6 Pr. 10 (I n. 31);
 8 Pr. 7 (IV n. 159);
 8, 2, 18 (IV n. 335);
 9, 4, 113 (III n. 125);
 10, 1, 7 (IV n. 159);
 10, 1, 122 (IV n. 72);
 10, 1, 125–31 (V n. 109);
 10, 1, 125 (IV n. 149);
 10, 3, 11–15 (IV n. 119);
 10, 4, 4 (IV n. 329);
 10, 5, 17 (IV n. 122);
 10, 5, 21–3 (IV n. 120);
 11, 1, 31–2 (III n. 112; IV n. 133);
 11, 1, 68 (II n. 190);
 12, 3, 9 (IV n. 43);
 12, 3, 11 (IV n. 43);
 12, 3, 11–12 (IV n. 174);
 12, 6, 3ff. (IV n. 122);
 12, 7, 3 (II n. 206);
 12, 10, 12 (IV n. 138);
 12, 11, 15–16 (IV n. 122)
- Ps.-Quintilian (1st cent. AD)
Decl. mai. (Declamationes maiores) 9, 10 (I n. 94; III n. 130)
Decl. min., (Declamationes minores) 290 p. 159 (I n. 62);
 298 pp. 176–7 (I n. 92);
 317 p. 247 (II n. 42);
 322 p. 266 (I n. 134);
 338 p. 333 (I n. 61)
- Rev. Eg. (Revue égyptologique)
 1919 (V n. 68)
- Sallust (Gaius Sallustius Crispus, 86–35 BC)
Cat. (De coniuratione Catilinae) 3, 3–5 (II n. 66);
 7, 4–5 (I n. 91);
 12, 2 (II n. 128);
 13, 4–5 (II n. 128);
 14, 1 (II n. 86);
 14, 6 (III n. 121);
 14, 15–16 (II n. 86; III n. 155);
 16, 1–3 (II n. 90);
 17, 6 (II n. 86, 129, 132);
 18, 4 (II n. 127);
 20, 1 (II n. 88);
 21, 1 (II n. 130);
 25, 3 (V n. 219);
 37, 7 (II n. 87, 132)
Iug. (De bello Iugurino) 63, 3 (I n. 92, 119)
- Ps.-Sallust, *Ad Caes. (Epistulae ad Caesarem senem de republica)* 1, 5, 5–6 (II n. 128);
 1, 5, 5 (III n. 139);
 1, 7, 2 (III n. 139);
 2, 1, 3 (II n. 66)
 Salvianus (c. AD 400–c. 475),
Eccl. (Ad ecclesiam) 3, 44 (I n. 25).
- Seneca the Elder (Lucius Annaeus Seneca, c. 55 BC–c. AD 40)
Contr. (Controversiae) 1 Pr. 8–10 (III n. 99);
 1 Pr. 8 (III n. 45; IV n. 164);
 1, 1, 32 (IV n. 126);
 2, 2, 9–11 (IV n. 128);
 2, 3, 3 (I n. 99);
 2, 6, 4 (I n. 27);
 2, 6, 11 (I n. 20, 63);
 4, 1 (V n. 15);
 7 Pr. 6 (IV n. 147);
 7, 3, 8 (IV n. 156);
 7, 7, 13–14 (II n. 42)

- Suas.* (*Suasoriae*) 2, 10 (IV n. 163)
- Seneca the Younger (Lucius Annaeus Seneca, 4/1 BC-AD 65)
- Ben.* (*De beneficiis*) 3, 37, 1-4 (V n. 43);
- 5, 5, 2 (V n. 48);
- 5, 17, 4 (V n. 39);
- 6, 38, 3 (III n. 112)
- Clem.* (*De dementia*) 2, 5, 2 (I n. 180);
- 3, 13, 3-7 (V n. 42);
- 3, 21, 1 (V n. 42)
- Ep.* (*Epistulae ad Lucilium*) 11, 1ff. (I n. 195);
- 11, 8 (V n. 95);
- 20, 2 (IV n. 192);
- 36, 1ff. (IV n. 171);
- 47, 17 (III n. 72);
- 50, 3 (I n. 92);
- 52, 8 (V n. 95);
- 56, 9 (I n. 94);
- 74, 21 (I n. 166);
- 87, 9 (III n. 91, 151);
- 88, 18-19 (III n. 23);
- 95, 13 (III n. 134);
- 95, 33 (III n. 81);
- 97, 9 (I n. 186);
- 99, 12-13 (III n. 90, 151);
- 99, 12 (V n. 48);
- 99, 13 (III n. 134);
- 108, 3-4 (IV n. 185);
- 108, 3 (V n. 108);
- 108, 7 (IV n. 191);
- 108, 10 (IV n. 230);
- 108, 11-12 (IV n. 191);
- 108, 12 (I n. 192; IV n. 207);
- 108, 13ff. (IV n. 185, 207);
- 108, 17ff. (IV n. 207);
- 108, 23 (I n. 121; IV n. 207);
- 108, 26-7 (I n. 192);
- 108, 27 (IV n. 15);
- 114, 21 (III n. 110, 116);
- 115, 2 (III n. 116);
- 118, 14 (I n. 22, 37);
- 121, 15-17 (I n. 22);
- 122, 6 (III n. 134)
- Ir.* (*De ira*) 1, 12, 4 (III n. 4);
- 3, 25, 2 (III n. 143; V n. 7);
- 3, 38, 1 (V n. 16)
- Marc.* (*Ad Marciam de consolatione*) 2, 3 (V n. 164);
- 12, 3 (I n. 31);
- 23, 3-5 (I n. 31, 32);
- 24, 1 (V n. 65);
- 24, 3 (V n. 164)
- N.Q.* (*Naturales Quaestiones*) 1, 17, 4 (IV n. 15)
- Phaedr.* (*Phaedra*) 290 (I n. 135);
- 453 (I n. 188)
- Phoen.* (*Phoenissae*) 353 (I n. 52)
- Prov.* (*De providentia*) 2, 5 (V n. 61)
- Ps.-Seneca, *Oct.* (*Octavia*) 189-91 (I n. 159);
- 446-7 (V n. 8)
- Servius (fl. c. AD 400)
- Aen.* (*Commentum Aeneadum*)
- 4, 157 (II n. 21);
- 6, 114 (I n. 163; V n. 128)
- Ecl.* (*Commentum Eclogarum*)
- 9, 35 (IV n. 329)
- Sextus Empiricus (2nd cent. AD),
- Pyrrh. hyp.* (*Purrhôneioi hypotupôseis*) 1, 105-6 (p. 1)
- Sidonius Apollinaris (Gaius Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius, AD 430/3-79), *Ep.* (*Epistulae*) 1, 2, 3 (I n. 193);
- 5, 17, 1ff. (III n. 24);
- 9, 14 (IV n. 122)
- Statius (P. Papinius Statius, c. AD 45-97), *Silv.* (*Silvae*) 1, 2, 26-9 (I n. 113);
- 1, 2, 100 (I n. 62);
- 1, 2, 128 (I n. 113);

- 3, 5, 24–8 (I n. 113);
 5, 2 (II n. 62);
 5, 2, 68–9 (I n. 85)
 Stobaeus (5th cent. AD),
Florilegium 4, 37, 4, 5 (V n. 156)
 Strabo (64/3 BC–AD 21),
Geographica 4, 1, 5 (III n. 202);
 5, 3, 8 (III n. 7);
 19, 2 (V n. 50)
 Suetonius (Gaius Suetonius
 Tranquillus, c. AD 69–c. 140)
Aug. (Augustus) 31, 6 (III n.
 181);
 38, 2 (III n. 175);
 43, 3 (III n. 63);
 43, 4 (III n. 60);
 68 (V n. 163; 205)
Caes. (Caesar) 4, 1 (II n. 201);
 27, 3 (II n. 114; III n. 157);
 39, 4 (III n. 60)
Cal. (Caligula) 4 (I n. 25);
 54, 2 (III n. 92);
 55, 7 (III n. 53)
Dom. (Domitianus) 4, 5 (III n.
 179)
*Gramm. (De grammaticis et
 rhetoribus)* 2, 1–2 (IV n. 37);
 25, 1 (IV n. 59);
 26, 1 (IV n. 77)
Nero 20, 1–2 (III n. 46);
 20, 6 (III n. 65);
 22, 1–2 (III n. 61);
 26, 1–4 (III n. 152, 165);
 26, 1 (I n. 58);
 57, 2 (III n. 67)
Tib. (Tiberius) 35, 3 (III n. 78)
 Suda (c. AD 1000), s.v. *Markianos*
 (V n. 107)
 Symmachus (Quintus Aurelius
 Symmachus, c. AD 340–c. 402),
Ep. (Epistulae) 5, 67 (III n. 21);
 5, 68 (III n. 21);
 5, 68, 2 (III n. 26);
 8, 23, 3 (III n. 13)
 Syrus (Publius Syrus, 1st cent.
 BC), *Sententiae* 566 (I n. 72,
 136);
 649 (I n. 72);
 703 (I n. 102)
 Tacitus (Cornelius Tacitus, c. AD
 55–c. 115)
Agr. (Agricola) 4, 5–6 (IV n.
 173);
 5, 2 (II n. 58)
Ann. (Annales) 2, 83, 5 (III n.
 179);
 3, 8, 4 (I n. 191);
 3, 31, 4–7 (V n. 19);
 3, 31, 7 (I n. 172);
 4, 17, 3 (II n. 153);
 6, 55, 3 (I n. 54);
 11, 22, 4 (I n. 121);
 13, 2, 2 (I n. 54);
 13, 12, 1ff. (I n. 68; V n. 139);
 13, 25, 1–3 (III n. 165);
 13, 25, 2 (III n. 167);
 13, 47, 5 (III n. 167);
 14, 14, 1ff. (III n. 62);
 14, 14, 4 (I n. 68);
 14, 15, 9–10 (III n. 65);
 14, 17 (III n. 75);
 14, 20, 5–6 (III n. 28);
 14, 20, 5 (V n. 204);
 14, 56, 2 (I n. 54);
 15, 71, 9 (V n. 107);
 16, 30, 3 (I n. 175)
D. (Dialogus de oratoribus) 2, 1
 (V n. 114);
 7, 3 (IV n. 71);
 28, 2 (III n. 50);
 20, 4 (IV n. 157);
 29, 3–4 (III n. 50, 69, 83);
 35, 1–5 (IV n. 6, 60)
Hist. (Historiae) 2, 62 (III n.
 63);
 4, 42, 5–6 (III n. 150)

- Terence (Publius Terentius Afer, 185?-159 BC)
Ad. (Adelphoe) passim (I n. 92);
 101-2 (I n. 66; III n. 129);
 150-3 (I n. 110)
Andr. (Andria) 51-4 (I n. 81);
 55ff. (III n. 120);
 151ff. (I n. 111);
 189-90 (I n. 115);
 262-4 (V n. 54);
 443ff. (I n. 111);
 555 (V n. 254);
 560ff. (I n. 111);
 694-7 (V n. 252);
 828ff. (I n. 111)
Heaut. (Heautontimorumenos)
 114-16 (V n. 54);
 971 (I n. 177)
Hec. (Hecyra) 114ff. (V n. 180, 263);
 448-9 (V n. 54)
Phorm. (Phormio) 80ff. (V n. 225);
 281-4 (II n. 193)
- Tertullian (Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, c. AD 160c. 240)
An. (De anima) 38, 1-2 (I n. 40)
Apol. (Apologeticus) 1, 1, 7 (I n. 25)
Bapt. (De baptismo) 1, 4 (I n. 25)
Cult. fem. (De cultu feminarum) 2, 8 (III n. 101)
Nat. (Ad nationes) 1, 16, 7 (I n. 25)
Virg. vel. (De virginibus velandis) 8, 2 (I n. 25)
- Theodosian Code (4th cent. AD) 2, 17 (I n. 16);
 7, 22, 2 Pr. (II n. 162);
 7, 22, 4 (II n. 162);
 12, 1, 7 (II n. 162);
 12, 1, 18, 1 (II n. 161, 162);
 12, 1, 19 (II n. 162, 167);
 12, 1, 35 (II n. 162);
 12, 1, 122 (II n. 167);
 14, 9 (III n. 216)
- Thucydides (c 460- c.400 BC),
Historiae 6, 9-18 (II n. 48)
- Tibullus (Albius Tibullus, 48?-19 BC), *Elegiae* 1, 1 (IV n. 368);
 1, 1, 75-8 (IV n. 364);
 2, 6, 44 (V n. 228)
- Valerius Maximus (fl. AD 14-37),
Facta et dicta memorabilia 2, 2, 9 (III n. 177);
 2, 4, 4 (III n. 77);
 5, 4, 4 (II n. 205);
 5, 6, 2 (II n. 25);
 6, 1, 7 (V n. 201);
 6, 1, 9 (V n. 200);
 6, 2, 8 (II n. 138);
 6, 9 ext. 1 (IV n. 181);
 7, 3, 10 (V n. 139);
 8, 1, 12 (I n. 48);
 8, 9 ext. 3 (IV n. 214);
 9, 3, 4 (II n. 34)
- Vegetius (Flavius Vegetius Renatus, fl. c. AD 400), *Epitome rei militaris* 1, 5 (II n. 60)
- Velleius Paterculus (c. 19 BC-c. AD 31), *Historia romana* 2, 67, 2 (V n. 62)
- Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro, 70-19 BC)
Aen. (Aeneid) 5, 295-6 (V n. 216);
 9, 176ff. (V n. 216);
 10, 324-7 (V n. 216);
 11, 154-5 (II n. 22)
B. (Bucolica) 4, 8ff. (IV n. 370);
 10, 69 (IV n. 302)
G. (Georgica) 4, 565 (IV n. 301)
- Xenophon (c. 428/7-c. 354 BC),

Mem. (Memorabilia) 2, 1, 21ff.
(I n. 42)

Zacharias (Zacharias Mytilenensis,
6th cent. AD), *V. Severi (Vita
Severi)* p. 52 (III n. 221)

Zonaras (Johannes Zonaras, 12th
cent. AD), *Annales* 8, 26 (II n.
46).

SUBJECT INDEX

- Adeodatus (son of Augustine) 231
 administration 49, 68, 116, 126, 133;
 see also bureaucracy
 Adrian (2nd cent. AD) 216, 216–5
adulescens, adulescentia 5
 adult toga 78, 92, 123, 138, 155, 157, 176, 235, 247;
 See also toga virilis
 adultery 13, 36, 205, 230, 234, 235, 240, 300n. 133
 adulthood, adults 8, 14, 33, 34–6, 36, 77, 182, 208, 223
 Aelius Stilo, Lucius (c. 154–90 BC) 138
 Aemilius Paullus, Lucius (c. 228–160 BC) and sons 43, 44, 172
 Aeneas 200
aetas 18, 27, 28;
 see also age
aetas lubrica 15, 36
affectio maritalis 229
 age 15, 18, 26, 27, 28, 74;
 see also aetas
 age category 40–4, 83;
 age limit, qualification 5–8, 52, 67, 116, 122, 272n. 37;
 age of reason 10–11
 ages of man 5
 aggressivity 104–10, 183, 184, 291n. 311
- Agricola, Gnaeus Iulius (AD 40–93) 48, 154
 Alexander the Great (356–323 BC) 45, 215
 Alexander Severus (AD 208–35) 65, 205–14
 Alexandria 111, 131
 Alfius Flavus (in Seneca the Elder) 146
 Alypius (friend of Augustine) 87, 93, 220, 227
 ambition 17, 26, 30, 37, 50, 63, 65, 72, 74, 75, 130, 155, 223
 amphitheatre 92–7;
 see also gladiator
 anal intercourse 233
 ancestors 84, 222, 224
 Antinous (d. AD 130) 237
 Antioch 91, 111–27 *passim*, 128
 Antiphon (in Terence) 239
 Antonius, Marcus *see* Mark Antony
 Apion (2nd cent. AD) 49
 Apollonia 64
 Apollonius of Tyana (1st cent. AD) 163, 167–4
 appearance 95–99, 245
 Appius Claudius (fl. c. 451 BC) 51, 52
 applause 89, 91, 141, 145, 153, 155
 Apsines (4th cent. AD) 118–3
 Apuleius (c. AD 123–c. 185) 12, 127, 170

- archaism 152–8
 ardour 28, 37, 162;
 see also ferocitas, impetuosity
 army 25, 40–50, 83, 126, 133, 233, 245;
 see also military career, military spirit
 arrogance 26, 37, 52, 121, 144, 145, 146–2, 195–4;
 see also snobbery
 Artemis 228
artes liberales 125
 asceticism 150, 158, 163–71, 166, 167, 170, 226–5
 asianist style 148–4
 Asinius Pollio, C. (76 BC–AD 5) 150
athenaeum 111, 145
 Athens 43, 60, 103, 111, 111–27
 passim, 127, 129, 133–9, 138, 213
 athletics 81–7
 Atratinus, Lucius Sempronius (b. 73 BC) 73–6
 Attalus (teacher of Seneca) 140–6, 164, 217
 Attia (mother of Augustus) 267n. 148
 atticist style 149–5
 Atticus (in Martial) 82
 Attis and Cybele (in Catullus) 181, 226
 audacity 26, 37, 65, 135;
 see also boldness, rashness, recklessness
 Augustine (AD 354–430) 25, 107–11, 113–18, 120–5, 129–5, 151–7, 158–5, 174–1, 177, 204, 210–20, 215–4, 220–9, 230–40
augustiniani 89
 Augustus (63 BC–AD 14) 7, 21, 646, 67, 109–13, 120–5, 226, 235
 Aurelius Asclepiades, Marcus (2nd cent. AD) 83
 Aurelius Magas, Marcus (AD c. 200) 276 n. 162
 authority 161, 215
 Baiae 79–3
 ball, ball-game 80, 81, 99, 117
 bands 50–63, 104–12, 111–27
barbatuli iuvenes 57, 60, 99, 101
 bashfulness 31;
 see also diffidence, *pudor*
 Basil the Great (c. AD 330–79) 122–7, 213–2
 bath 79, 114, 117, 122, 165, 225;
 see also thermae
 beard 96, 97, 175;
 see also barbatuli iuvenes
 beardless 64, 83, 110, 173;
 see also inberbus iuvenis
 beating at school 197, 278n. 230
 beauty 74, 227, 237, 239–9, 256n. 92;
 see also elegance
 beauty care 95–99;
 contest 239
 Beirut 111, 115, 117, 133
 Bible 152, 161
 bilingualism 126
 bird-catching 80
 birth certificate 106
 bisexuality 236
 blood 28–29, 40
 blushing 39–1, 52, 74, 133, 221, 227, 234, 239, 240;
 see also diffidence
 body 28–29, 166
 bodyguard 50–63 *passim*
 boldness 37, 76, 104–10;
 see also audacity
 Bona Dea 56
 books 127, 129–5, 131, 158, 17280, 212
 boxing 78, 80, 82
 brothel 110, 224–3

- Brutus, Lucius Iunius (cons. 509 BC) and sons 51
 Brutus, Marcus Iunius (85–42 BC) 43, 59, 60–3
bullā 5, 19, 176
 bureaucracy 71, 83;
 see also administration
 Burgundio (friend of Sidonius Apollinaris) 145–1
 Burrus, Sextus Afranius (d. AD 62) 89
- Caelius Rufus, Marcus (82?–48 BC) 14, 17–18, 56, 59–2, 62, 63, 74, 75, 77, 97, 197
 Caesar, Gaius Iulius (100–44 BC) 48, 59–2, 77, 103, 104, 184, 204, 235
 Caeso, Quinctius (5th cent. BC) 52–6, 63, 104, 197
 Caligula (AD 11–40) 87, 92, 94, 107
 Callidamates (in Plautus) 209
 Callimachus (c. 305–c. 240 BC) 186
 Calvus, Gaius Licinius (92–47 BC) 150, 184, 209, 210
 Camillus, Marcus Furius (d. 365 BC) 46
 Campus Martius 36, 58, 78–2, 110, 206
 Canusium 276n. 175
cantores Euphorionis 173
 Caracalla (AD 188–217) 65, 86
 Carneades (214–129 BC) 154, 217
 carousal 13, 115, 117;
 see also parties, revelling
 Carthage 111, 113, 119, 120, 212
 castration 181, 226
 Catiline (Lucius Sergius Catilina, c. 108–62 BC) 54–8, 99, 101, 104, 215, 234
 Cato, Gaius Porcius (trib. 56 BC) 60
- Cato Censorius, Marcus Porcius (234–149 BC) 71, 84, 123–9, 154, 216, 224;
 his son 43, 124
 Cato Uticensis, Marcus Porcius (95–46 BC) 265n. 105;
 his son 43, 60
 Catullus, Gaius Valerius (77?–47? BC) 22, 175, 176, 179, 180, 184, 184, 186, 192, 193, 197, 209–18, 240–50, 243–3, 245–5
 celibacy 163, 165, 334–7
cereus 36;
 see also pliability, weakness
 Cestius (in Seneca the Elder) 146
 changeability 29, 30, 35, 36, 37, 208
 character 31, 107, 171, 174, 204
 characteristics of youth 29–40
 Charinus (in Plautus) 209
 chariot-driving, races 78, 87, 117, 121;
 see also circus
 chastity 109, 165, 227, 228–8, 234;
 see also purity
 cheerfulness 38, 41, 101
 child(hood) 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 34, 35, 66, 78, 87, 127, 136, 138, 223, 225
 Chremes (in Terence) 24
 Christianity 3, 126, 162, 169, 172–8, 177, 214, 226
 Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106–43 BC) 56–59, 60, 64, 71, 75–8, 102–5, 127, 130, 137–5, 149, 157, 184, 202–12, 216, 218, 226, 234–4;
 and Lucius 133–9;
 his nephew, Quintus (67–43 BC) 203–12, 205;
 his son, Marcus (65–c. 27 BC) 43, 60, 102–6, 202–11
 Cinna, Gaius Helvius (d. 44 BC) 186–4, 209–18

- circumscriptio adulescentium* 6,
103
 circus 86–89;
 see also chariot-driving
 city youth 21
 civil war 59, 189, 190–8, 193, 194
 Clermont-Ferrand 145
 Clitiphon (in Terence) 201–10
 Clodia (sister of Clodius Pulcher)
 14, 79–3, 101, 104, 238
 Clodius Pulcher, Publius (c. 92–52
 BC) 45, 56–9, 58, 234.
 clothing 95, 96, 97, 147, 165
 cock-fights 87
collegia iuvenum 109–14, 273n. 75
 Commodus (AD 161–92) 20, 65, 66,
 94, 107
concessum aetati 223–2
concordia aetatum 9
 confusion 37, 144, 239, 240–50,
 243, 245
 conspiracy 50–3, 54–8, 189, 264n.
 67
 Constantinople 88, 95, 105, 115,
 117
 consulate 65, 268n. 165
controversia 125, 140–7
 conversion 80, 143, 157–7
 Corinna (beloved of Ovid) 176, 182,
 184, 244
 Corinth 113, 131
 Coriolanus, Gnaeus Marcius (5th
 cent. BC) 205
 Cornelius Gallus (c. 69–26 BC) 175
 Cornutus, Lucius Annaeus (teacher
 of Persius) 19, 157
 Croton 167
 Cotta, Marcus Aurelius (cons. 74
 BC) and son 78
 counter-culture 189
 countryside 21, 55, 87
 courage 30, 31, 37, 38, 42–6, 75, 76,
 79, 109
 courtesan 21, 238;
 see also love
 courtship 241–1
 Crassus, Lucius Licinius (140–91
 BC) 71, 74–7, 77, 135, 137–3,
 148, 218
 Crassus, Publius Licinius (c. 85–53
 BC) 45, 265n. 109, 218
 Crates of Mallos (fl. 168 BC) 132
 Cratippus (1st cent. BC) 203
 criminality 115, 197;
 see also cruelty, vandalism
 crisis, youth as 10–18;
 its causes 18–29
 critical spirit 131, 155–2
 cruelty 37, 65, 197
cura minorum 7, 69–2, 102
 Curio, C. Scribonius (c. 84–49 BC)
 44, 57, 59, 60, 63, 235–5
 curiosity 170, 182, 240
cursus honorum 5, 26
 Curtius, Marcus (Roman hero) 42
 cynicism 59
 Cynthia (beloved of Propertius) 184,
 185, 192, 242–2, 244
 dance 84–8, 95, 153, 217, 240
 dancing schools 84
 dandies 94, 95–99
 Daphnis and Chloe (in Longus) 238–
 8
 debauchery *see* licentiousness
decemviri 52
 declamation 138, 139, 202;
 see also controversia, suasoria
decurio 67, 68, 116, 267n. 161
 Delia (beloved of Tibullus) 184
 desires *see* passions
 development, intellectual 10–13,
 141
 dialectic 11, 160–7, 165
 diffidence 39–1, 146, 156;
 see also bashfulness, blushing,
 pudor, shame
 Diodotus (d. 60 BC) 138–4

Dioscorus (friend of Augustine) 128–4
 discus 79
 discussion 11, 128–4, 130–6, 132, 156, 160, 162, 168, 177, 213
 dogs 36, 55, 78, 80, 97, 99
 Dolabella, P. Cornelius (c. 70–42 BC) 24–6, 59
 down, first 234
 dowry 209, 231, 239
 dream-world 182, 192, 203
 drunkenness 13, 20, 201, 202
 education, educators 15–18, 22, 36, 37, 174;
 educational system 123–31, 215;
 see also parents, teachers, school
 effeminacy 57, 85, 95–99 *passim*
 Elagabalus (AD 204–22) 65, 66
 elections 58
 elegance 38, 95–99;
 see also beauty
 eloquence 70–78, 134–59, 157, 176
 emancipation 102
 emotionality 174–1, 181, 240–50;
 see also feelings
 emperors, young 19, 65–8
ephebi 109
 epic poetry 184–2
 Epicureanism 157, 162
 epilation 96, 98, 235
equites 62, 68, 109
erastes 220, 233, 235, 237
 ‘Erlebnisdichtung’ 180
eromenos 233, 235
 errors of youth 15, 106, 140, 203
 escapism 193–2
 eunuch 226
 Euphorion (c. 275–c. 210 BC) 186
 Euryalus (in Virgil) 237
 Eutychus (in Plautus) 209
eversores 113–18
 excessive behaviour, feelings 31;

see also immoderateness, impetuosity
excusatio aetatis 17;
 see also plea of youth
 experimentation 11, 16
 extravagance 18, 95–98;
 see also luxury
 exuberance:
 in character 17–18;
 in style 147–4
 Fabius Maximus Cunctator, Quintus (c. 280–203 BC) 45, 46–9
factiones 86–87;
 See also fan-club
 falcon 80, 99
 fame 75, 188, 190, 193, 223, 231, 237, 241;
 see also glory
 family *see* parents
 family council 136
 fan-club 91, 137;
 see also *factiones*
 father (and son) 19, 20, 22, 23–6, 43–6, 44, 66, 68, 78, 87, 99, 100, 101, 123–9, 131, 164, 175, 176, 192, 215, 217, 235–5, 244, 300n. 139;
 see also parents, sons
 Favorinus (c. AD 85–c. 150) 153
 fee 121, 128
 feelings 174–1, 184–1, 195–55;
 see also emotionality
fellatio 223, 233
ferocitas 8, 36, 249;
 see also ardour, impetuosity
fescennini 91
 festival 214, 217;
 see also spectacles
 fidelity 192, 244–4
 fighting 42–9 *passim*, 104–10, 113, 117–3, 121
 flatterers 22, 156
flexus aetatis, youth as the 14

- footwear 97–1
 free time *see otium*
 freedom 16, 18–19, 36, 51, 56, 61, 87, 189, 241
 freedom of speech 75–9
 freshmen 112–20
 friend(ship) 8, 19, 31, 93, 108–12, 114, 127, 128, 157, 162, 192, 207–22, 219–8, 237
 frivolity 6, 38
 Fronto, Marcus Cornelius (c. AD 100–c. 160) 219–8, 237
 Furius Medullinus, Lucius (4th cent. BC) 46
 Fuscus, Arellius (in Seneca the Elder) 153
 Fuscus Salinator (friend of Pliny the Younger) 73

 Galen (Claudius Galenus, AD 129–99?) 82, 128, 131
galli 226
 gambling 13, 103, 117
 gangs *see* bands
 generation gap, conflict 44, 45–9, 55, 63–7, 197–6, 200–13
 Geta, Lucius Septimius (189–212 AD) 87
 girls 3, 84, 86, 157, 174, 183, 223, 229, 231, 238–55
 gladiator 82, 86, 92–7, 103, 127; *see also* amphitheatre
 glory, desire for 17, 37; *see also* fame
 gluttony 13, 95
 Golden Age 193, 194
 Gorgias (1st cent. BC) 202–11
 grammarian, *grammaticus* 124, 132
 Gregory of Nazianzen (AD 329/30–90) 96–97, 122–7, 213–2
 group *see* bands, peer-group
 guardianship *see cura minorum*, *tutela impuberum*
 guidance *see* supervision

 guilt-culture 228
 gymnasium 81–5, 233, 271n. 29

 Hadrian (AD 76–138) 111, 237
 hair 89, 95, 96, 98–2, 165
 harlot *see* prostitute
 hatred 184
 Hegesias (3rd cent. BC) 166
 Heracles at the crossroads 12, 136, 226
 Hermogenes (2nd cent. AD) 146
 hero-worship *see* idol
 Herodes Atticus (c. AD 101–c. 177) 160–7
 Hierus (4th cent. AD) 215–4
 high-mindedness *see* idealism
 Hipparchia (c. 300 BC) 157
 Hippolytus (in Euripides) 228–8
 history, interest in 131–7
 homosexuality 226, 232–6;
 the active and the passive role 233, 302n. 185;
 see also pederasty
 hooliganism *see* vandalism
 hoop 80, 81
 hope, full of 30–2
 Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus, 65–8 BC) 60, 127–3, 183–90, 185, 194, 200, 226
 horse 36, 55, 78, 97, 99–3, 110, 121;
 horse-racing 78, 79, 86, 127;
 see also circus
Hortensius 151, 158, 161
 Hortensius Hortalus, Quintus (114–50 BC) 138, 148–4, 216
 Hostus (c. 215 BC) 44
 hot bloodedness 28–29, 30
 hot-headedness *see* impetuosity
humanitas 145, 180
 humour, sense of 31, 182
 hunting 71, 80–5, 110, 216

 Iamblichus (c. AD 250–c. 325) 168
 idealism 31, 39, 142, 165, 249

identity crisis 210
 idol 73, 76, 90, 91, 112, 137, 143,
 157–4, 177, 214–30
 imagination 141–7, 179;
 See also inventiveness
 immoderateness 37;
 see also excessive behaviour
 impetuosity 8, 13, 17, 26, 36, 37,
 44, 53, 149, 246;
 see also ardour, *ferocitas*,
 impulsivity, rashness
impueres 7, 70
 impudence 31, 52, 72, 119;
 see also insolence, irreverence
 impulses, impulsivity 13, 27–29, 30;
 see also impetuosity
inberbus iuuenis 35–7, 78;
 see also beardless
 incest 223, 235
 incontinence 21, 34;
 see also licentiousness
 (in)experience 6, 16, 18, 26, 66, 73,
 102, 144–50, 174, 195
 initiation 5, 170
 innocence 11, 14, 36, 109;
 see also purity
 innovations 66;
 see also originality
 insolence 31;
 see also impudence
interior homo 10
 inventiveness 148;
 see also imagination, originality
iocus 15, 38;
 see also *ludus*
 irreverence 31, 36, 37, 195–6;
 see also impudence,
 shamelessness
irrumatio 223, 233
 Isis 170
 island of the blessed, the 194
 isolation 12
iuniores 5, 41
Iunius 41

ius vitae necisque 199
iuuenalis lex 8
iuuenilia 89, 110
iuuenis 5
 Iuventas 41, 109, 110
iuuentus 5, 40–4, 62–5, 247

 javelin 79
 jealousy 37, 47, 84, 155, 236, 244
 Jerome (c. AD 348–420) 173, 284n.
 146
 John Cassian (c. AD 360–430) 1728
 John Chrysostom (c. AD 354–407)
 213
 Julian (AD 322–63) 129, 168–5, 174
 Julius Secundus (1st cent. AD) 144,
 218
 Junius Avitus (friend of Pliny the
 Younger) 195, 219
 justice, sense of 75–8
 Juventius (in Catullus) 236–6

 kidnapping 113
 knights *see equites*
 knowledge, thirst for 126–4, 174

 Laodamia and Protesilaus (in
 Catullus) 181
 Latin, study of 126, 133
 law courts 70–78, 80;
 law schools, studies 111, 122,
 132–8
 lecture, public 121–6, 145–1
 leisure *see otium*
 leisured classes 3, 21
 Lesbia (beloved of Catullus) 181,
 184, 192, 240–50, 245–5
 Lesbianicus (in Plautus) 209, 226
Lex Aelia Sentia (AD 4) 268 n. 171
Lex Fannia (161 BC) 234
Lex Plaetoria (c. 200 BC) 5–6, 103,
 247
Lex Villia Annalis (180 BC) 7–8, 26,
 63, 247

- Libanius (AD 314–c. 393) 92–6, 113, 127
 Liber 5
 liberty *see* freedom
libidines adulescentiae 258n. 135;
 see also passions
 library 172, 173, 174
 licentiousness 26, 51, 52, 57, 82, 197, 201
 see also incontinence
 Licentius (pupil of Augustine) 85, 177, 220–9
 life as a stormy sea 14, 20, 26;
 as a race-course 14
 logical thought 10, 27
 love 30, 34, 38, 79, 146, 163, 184–1, 191–9, 208, 238–55;
 affair 13, 23–5, 201;
 awakening of 238–8;
 farewell to 245–5;
 at first sight 239–9;
 happiness in 242–2;
 as madness 241;
 sickness, sufferings 226, 243, 245, 246
 lower classes 3, 21, 88, 126, 135, 136–2, 230;
 see also poor people
lubrica aetas see aetas lubrica
 Lucan (AD 39–65) 176, 184, 189
 Lucian (c. AD 120–c. 180) 136–2
 Lucilius (148?–102 BC) 176, 178, 184
 Lucius (in Apuleius) 105, 170
ludere, poetry as a 180, 186
ludi maximi 54
ludus aetatis 16, 23, 38, 100, 185, 223;
 see also *iocus*
 Lupercalia 41, 110
 luxury 22, 36, 55, 87, 94, 95–99;
 see also extravagance
 Lygdamus (b. 43 BC) 184
 lyrical poetry 178–93
 Lysiteles (in Plautus) 209, 226
 Macedo (fl. c. AD 69–79) 103
 madness, youth as 14
 Maecenas, Gaeus (c. 70–8 BC) 7–8, 110, 184, 185
 magic 143, 168, 170
 male prostitution 21, 99, 225, 234
 Mammaea (mother of Alexander Severus) 206
 Manichaeism 161–8, 205, 210
 Manlius Torquatus, Lucius (cons. 65 BC), his son 73
 Manlius Torquatus, Titus (cons. 235 BC) and son 43–6
 Marcellus (friend of Seneca) 227
 Marcellus, Claudius (c. 226 BC) 234
 Marcus Aurelius (AD 121–80) 20, 79, 80, 129, 134, 143, 163, 172, 200, 219–8, 237
 Marius, Gaius (c. 157–86 BC) 25, 54
 Mark Antony (143–87 BC) 137–3, 148, 218
 Mark Antony (82–30 BC) 58, 59, 64–7, 235–5
 marriage 23–6, 87, 90, 163, 192, 193, 223, 226, 229–41, 236, 238;
 age of 23, 229, 231–1;
 aversion to 238;
 child marriage 231–1;
 laws 230
 Marseilles 111
 masturbation 223, 224
 mathematics 130
 maturity 8, 10, 20, 77
 medicine 82, 131
 Megabocchus (1st cent. BC) 57
 memory 143, 156
 Metilius Rufus (fl. c. 1 BC) 151
 military:
 career 47–49;
 service 103;

- spirit, lack of 47–49, 108–14;
 see also army
- mime 90, 121
- minores XXV annis* 6, 70
- miracle 168, 169
- mirror 96, 98
- Mnesilochus (in Plautus) 209
- mockery 41, 190, 191
- modernity 173
- Molo (1st cent. BC) 139, 149
- money 21, 38, 61, 94, 98, 102–7,
 127, 190, 241, 242;
 lending 6–7, 103, 113, 117, 121;
 see also prodigality
- Monica (mother of Augustine) 85,
 108, 205, 231
- mos maiorum* 153, 189
- mother (and son) 11, 108, 123, 154,
 163, 205–15, 267n. 148
- munera* 67, 69
- music 84–8, 89, 95, 240;
 at school 84–8
- Musonius Rufus (1st cent. AD) 217,
 226
- mystery cults 164, 169–6
- mythology 180–7, 182, 193

- naivety 30, 31, 38
- Naples 89, 97
- Narcissus (in Ovid) 227–7
- natural sciences 130
- nature, human 15, 16, 144, 226
- Neaera (beloved of Lygdamus) 184
- Nebridius (friend of Augustine) 162–
 9
- neoi* 109
- Neoplatonism 167, 168–5
- Neopythagoreanism 163, 167–4,
 226
- Nepotianus (friend of Jerome) 220
- nequitia* 173, 209
- Nero (AD 15–86) 20, 65, 81–5, 83,
 88–3, 106–10, 189, 300n. 139

- Nicander (friend of Plutarch) 19,
 155
- Nigrinus (in Lucian) 165
- Nisus (in Virgil) 237
- nuces relinquere* 269n. 4
- nugae* 180
- nutrix* 124

- obedience 198
- obscenity 184, 192, 223
- obscurity in poetry 186–5
- Octavian *see* Augustus
- office-holding by children *see*
 officials:
 young
- officers, young 47–49, 109
- officials, young 66–70, 116–1, 267n.
 155, 268n. 168
- old age, older people 8, 9, 14, 22–4,
 28, 29, 31–4, 35, 36, 45, 46, 51,
 52, 66, 146, 149, 164, 173, 174,
 184, 191, 195–6, 223
- Orestes and Pylades 211
- Origen (AD 185/6–254/5) 226, 278n.
 238
- originality 150, 188;
 see also inventiveness
- Otho (AD 32–69) 106, 107
- otium 21–3, 107, 190
- Ovid (43 BC–AD 17) 146, 172, 175,
 176–3, 182–9, 184, 185, 193

- pacifism 193
- paedagogus* 19, 35, 36, 120, 124
- palaestra* 81
- paleness 240, 245
- Pamphilus (in Terence) 24, 244
- panegyric 145
- pankration 83
- pantomime 90, 91, 121
- paraklausithyron* 242
- parents (and children) 11, 13, 15,
 72, 91, 98, 100, 102, 128, 141,

- 154, 197, 198–14, 225, 231, 233, 242, 243;
see also father, mother
 parricide 71, 103, 198, 199–8
 parties 96, 113, 214, 216;
see also carousal, revelling
 passions 11, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26, 2729, 34, 36;
see also libidines adolescentiae
patria potestas 198–7
 patricians 51–6
 patrimony 102, 127
 patron, *patronus* 128
 peace 193
peculium 102
 pederasty 81, 182, 232–3;
see also homosexuality
 peer(-group) 22, 100, 108–12, 109–26, 212
 Peleus and Thetis (in Catullus) 181
 perfume 95, 98
 Pergamum 131
pergraeuari 101
 permissivism 15–18, 223–3
 Perseus (fl. 179–168 BC) 21, 43, 44, 172
 Persius Flaccus, Aulus (AD 34–62)
 19, 157, 184, 184, 187–5, 188–6
 pets 99–3
 Phaedria (in Terence) 74, 239
 Pharsalus, battle of (48 BC) 44, 60
 Philippi, battle of (42 BC) 43, 183, 189
 Philolaches (in Plautus) 101, 209
 Philon of Larissa (160/59–80 BC)
 138, 157
 philosopher, philosophy 59, 80, 99, 131, 140, 143–9, 154–76, 177, 217–6
 Photis (in Apuleius) 105
pietas 198, 199, 200, 246;
see also respect
 Piraeus 112, 113
 Piso, Gnaeus Calpurnius (d. 64 BC)
 189
 Pistoclerus (in Plautus) 209
 pity, inclined to 30
 play 35, 78, 223
 playfulness 38
 plea of youth, the 17, 73, 73–6, 76, 78, 100, 200
 pleasure 14, 87;
see also ludus aetatis, voluptates adolescentiae
 pleasure in inflicting injury 10711
 plebeians 51–6
 pliability 36, 38, 39, 55
 Pliny the Younger (c. AD 61–c. 112)
 72–5, 131–7, 137, 219
 Plotius Gallus, Lucius (fl. c. 92 BC)
 135
 pneumonia 29
 poet, poetry 124, 138, 157, 170–195;
 arty type of 175;
 moral dangers connected with 171;
 as a preparation for philosophy 171, 177;
 sincerity in 178–5;
 by young authors 175–195;
 for young readers 171–175
poeta doctus 181, 186
poetae novi 175, 180, 189, 190
 Polemo (d. 270 BC) 157
 politics 25–8, 50–70, 176
 Polybius (c. 203–c. 118 BC) 221–30
 Pompeia (Caesar's wife) 56
 Pompey the Great (106–49 BC) 60, 63–6, 215
pons Mulvius 107
 poor people, poverty 3, 83, 104, 105–9, 117, 120, 127–3, 136–2, 158, 197, 198;
see also lower classes
 Porcius Latro (d. AD 4) 216
praetextati of Canusium 276n. 175

- prayer 246
 precocity 9, 146, 147;
 see also puer senex
 problem, oneself as a 211, 221–30
 prodigality 30, 36, 61, 95, 98, 102–7,
 113, 117, 209
 priesthood 263n. 55
 Prohaeresius (c. AD 276–367/8)
 112–17, 119, 128
 Propertius (c. 47–c. 15 BC) 175,
 176, 181–8, 184, 185–3, 187, 192,
 193, 242–2, 244, 306n. 265
 prostitute, prostitution 55, 100,
 101, 103, 117, 224–3, 230
 psycho-social moratory 8, 78
pubertas animalis, carnalis 11
 puberty 5, 10, 11, 12, 28, 51, 91,
 107, 197, 225, 232
pudor 39–1, 138;
 see also diffidence, shame
puer senex 9–10
pueritia 5, 41
 Punic War, second (218–201 BC) 6,
 20, 135
 punishing at school 278n. 230
 pupil *see* student
 purity 158, 192, 228–8, 246;
 see also chastity, innocence
 Pydna, battle of (168 BC) 20–2, 43,
 221
 Pyramus and Thisbe 177
 Pythagoras 12, 167

quadruplator 103
 quaestorship 7, 68, 109
 quarrels, lover's 244
 Quintilia (beloved of Calvus) 184

 rashness 6, 26, 38, 44, 52, 53, 65,
 76, 132;
 see also impetuosity, impulsivity
 reason 16, 19–1, 28, 29, 148, 161,
 230, 245

 rebelliousness *see* revolutionary
 youth
 rebuke 14, 118, 120, 156, 278n. 230
 recklessness 37, 44, 45, 46, 135;
 see also audacity
 recruit 44
 religion 165–6, 214
 respect 52, 195, 198;
 see also pietas, reverence
 responsibility 26–8, 47
 restlessness 37;
 see also impetuosity
 revelling 13, 100–4, 106, 231;
 see also carousal
 reverence:
 to the young 90, 225;
 to older people 37, 195, 198
 revolutionary youth 50–3, 54–63
 passim, 180, 189–195
 rhetor, rhetorician 124, 136, 140–
 50, 154–60, 216–5
rhetoires latini 134, 138
Rhetoric to Herennius 135–1
 rhetorical schools 71–4
 Rhodes 77, 111, 138, 139, 149
 rite of passage 5
 rivalry 51, 87, 214
rogatio Terentilia (461 BC) 52
 Romanianus (*patronus* of
 Augustine) 205, 280n. 13
Romuli nepotes 184, 197
 Romulus (founder of Rome) 41
 Rufinus (in Apuleius) 92
 Rufus (in Juvenal) 197
 Rufus, Marcus Minicius (cons. 221
 BC) 46
 running 78, 80, 82

sagatio (being tossed in a blanket)
 106, 120
 Sallust (86–35 BC) 50, 234
satura 41, 91
 Saturnalia 129

- Scaevola, Gaius Mucius (6th cent. BC) 42
- Scaevola, Quintus Mucius (cons. 117 BC) 138
- school 72, 233;
see also dancing, rhetorical, wrestling school
- school exercises *see controversia, suasoria*
- Scipio Aemilianus Africanus (185/4–129 BC) 43, 71, 80, 172, 180, 221–30
- Scipio Africanus Maior (236–184 BC) 43, 45, 46–9, 63
- Scipio Asiaticus (cons. 192 BC) 71
- Scopelian of Clazomenae (1st cent. AD) 136, 216, 298n. 103
- sculptor 136
- self-advancement by study 126, 136–2
- self-confidence, lack of 144, 221–29
- Sempronia (1st cent. BC) 238
- Sempronius (2nd cent AD) 206
- senatusconsultum Macedonianum* 103
- Seneca, L. Annaeus (4/1 BC–AD 65) 89, 151, 157–4, 163–71, 217
- seniores* 5, 41, 44
- sententiae* 152, 159–6, 171
- Septimius Severus (AD 145/6–211) and sons 87
- serenade 242
- seriousness 8, 9, 184, 192
- Servilius Ahala, Gaius (c. 439 BC) 54
- Servius (fl. c. AD 400) 40
- Servius Tullius (578?–535? BC) 5, 41
- sex 30, 34, 96–97, 223–55
- sexagesis* 198
- sexegenarios de ponte* 197–6
- shame 74, 156, 227;
see also diffidence, *pudor*
- shame culture 228
- shamelessness 36, 72, 115, 121–6;
see also irreverence
- silence, an adornment to youth 155
- Simo (in Plautus) 24
- Siro (teacher of Virgil) 157
- slander 74, 234–4, 303n. 207
- slippery age, youth as the 15;
see also lubrica aetas
- Smyrna 131
- snobbery 97, 165;
see also arrogance
- social criticism 190
- social promotion 72, 126–2, 137
- society, aversion to 184, 190, 191
- Socrates (469–399 BC) 197
- soldier, common 49–2
- son 23, 24, 193, 198–15;
see also father, mother, parents
- sophists 111–27 *passim*, 136
- Sotion (teacher of Seneca) 163–70
- Sounion 112, 113
- Spartan brides 232
- spectacles *see* amphitheatre, circus, festival, theatre
- spendthrifts *see* prodigality
- spleen 210–20
- spontaneity 39
- sports 78–7, 110
- stage-fright 74–7
- stenography 133
- stoicism 156, 157, 163, 166, 184, 226
- stress 75
- student(s) 60–3, 64, 87, 93, 111–27, 130, 131, 132, 140–52, 155–2, 157–4, 160–7, 165, 167–4, 197, 213–2;
 age of 14, 116, 120, 122, 216–5;
 fightings, riots 113, 117–3, 121;
 ill-treatment of (own) teacher 118–6;
 legislation concerning 114–19;
 shanghaiing of new students 112–17;

- teasing of freshmen 113–19, 213
- study centres 111–27
- study trip 58, 77, 139
- style, juvenile 147–9, 180–90
- suasoria* 124–30, 140–7
- Subura 19, 104, 224
- suicide 71, 77, 166, 189, 197, 234, 245
- Sulla, Lucius Cornelius (138–78 BC) 7, 54, 63–6, 67
- Sulpicius Rufus, Publius (124–82 BC) 148, 218
- superlatives 155
- supervision, youth in need of 13, 15, 20, 165, 171, 197, 215, 266n. 141
- swimming 79
- Sybaris (in Horace) 79
- Symmachus, Q. Aurelius (c. AD 348–402) and son 68

- Tacitus, Cornelius (c. AD 55–c. 115) 137, 218–7
- Tacitus, Marcus Claudius (d. AD 276) 66
- Tagaste 212
- Tarquinius Superbus (c. 509 BC), sons of 50–3
- Taurus, Calvisius (2nd cent. AD) 129
- teacher 13, 19, 23, 66, 86, 88, 110, 111–27 *passim*, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 141, 155–2, 165, 167, 168, 188, 197, 216–5, 219, 222, 225; *see also* grammarian, philosopher, rhetorician, sophist
- temerity *see* audacity
- tenderness 180, 244
- Terence (185?–159 BC) 173, 175, 180
- terminology 5
- testament-hunters 103

- theatre 91–5, 115, 117, 127, 174–1
- theft 13, 91, 103, 107–11, 121
- Themistocles (4th cent. AD) 119
- Theocritus (c. 300–c. 260 BC) 183
- thermae* 79
- Theseus and Ariadne (in Catullus) 181
- Thrasyllus (in Apuleius) 231
- Tibullus (c. 48–19 BC) 175, 182, 183, 193, 194
- tirocinium adulescentiae* 8
- tirocinium fori* 123
- toga praetexta* 5, 19
- toga virilis* 5, 19–1, 267n. 143, 281n. 41; *see also* adult toga
- tonguing 223
- top hits 85, 121
- toys 78, 88
- travelling 133–9; *see also* study- trip
- triumph 64
- triumviri* 57
- trossuli* 94
- truth 131, 161–8, 164
- Tullia (daughter of Cicero) 24–6
- tutela impuberum* 7
- tyrannicide 61, 142

- Ummidius Quadratus (friend of Pliny the Younger) 73, 90
- useful, aversion to the 31, 36, 38, 207–16
- usurer 103

- Valentinian II (AD 371–92) 90
- vandalism 104–12
- Varro, Marcus Terentius (117–27 BC) 5, 6, 7, 138
- vegetarianism 163–70
- venia aetatis* 7
- Veranius (friend of Catullus) 209
- Verus (AD 130–69) 107
- veterans, sons of 67

- Vettius, Lucius (1st cent. BC) 59
 Veturius Calvinus (c. 326 BC) 234
 vices 12–13, 14, 15, 21, 36–40
 passim, 66, 90, 109;
 see also vitia aetatis
 vices, apologia of 190
 victory 30, 42
 violence 51, 242, 244;
 see also criminality, vandalism
vir gravis as ideal 190
 Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro, 70–
 19 BC) 157, 173, 177, 183, 185,
 186, 193
 Virtue 12–13, 77
vitia aetatis 15, 90;
 see also vices
vitia fortunae 21
 vocation 85, 131, 157–5, 176, 177,
 178
voluptates adulescentiae 258n. 134
- weakness 8, 14, 27, 36, 50, 70
 wisdom 9, 14, 159
 wit 31, 101
 women, married 13, 79, 86, 92, 94,
 106, 223, 226, 238, 240
 words, beautiful 141, 151, 152
 wrestling 78, 80
 wrestling school 81, 82
- Y as a symbol of human life 11–12